STUDIES IN SOCIAL LIFE.

GEORGE C. LORIMER, LL.D.

Library of The Theological Seminary
PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

HN64
.L87

Grace E. Walker

STUDIES IN SOCIAL LIFE:

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 2 1948
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A REVIEW OF

THE PRINCIPLES, PRACTICES, AND PROBLEMS OF SOCIETY.

By GEORGE C. LORIMER, LL. D.

Author of "The Great Conflict," "Jesus the World's Savior," "Isms Old and New."

---

* * * "*I call that mind free, which protects itself against the usurpations of society, which does not cower to human opinion, which feels itself accountable to a higher tribunal than man's, which respects a higher law than fashion, which respects itself too much to be the slave or tool of the many or the few.*" CHANNING.

CHICAGO AND NEW YORK:
BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.
1886.

COPYRIGHT,
1886.
BELFORD, CLARKE & CO.

DONOHUE & HENNEBERRY, Printers and Binders, Chicago.

FROM

WILLIAM C. RICHARDS

TO

ROBERT BROWNING.

Thy genius, BROWNING, to this book hath lent—
Like Sculptor's skill in some cathedral shrine—
A subtle charm of grace to its design,
And to its chapters matchless ornament.
Not vainly to thy wells its Author went
For draughts of truth and wisdom half divine;
The purer-one must draw there with deep line—
And think as deep to catch their strong intent.

For texts so rare that fit so rare his themes—
No less to thee the Author owes than brings
His own, and, by foreglance, his readers praise;
While to his friend the well-blent service seems
Complete, as when some world-famed tenor sings,
And sermons match the singer's lofty lays.

TO

MY WIFE:

"Take them, Love, the book and me together:
Where the heart lies, let the brain lie also."

CONTENTS.

I.

The Solidarity of Society..... 11

II.

The Progress of Society..... 56

III.

The Inequalities of Society..... 117

IV.

The Sufferings of Society..... 195

V.

The Vices of Society..... 248

VI.

The Impositions of Society..... 316

VII.

The Divisions of Society..... 341

VIII.

The Amusements of Society..... 377

IX.

The Education of Society..... 414

X.

The Hope of Society..... 454

I am sitting by my window looking out upon the sea. The waves are rolling royally and are fighting with each other convulsively, the incoming billow seeking to overtake and overwhelm the one that is nearing the shore, and all the rest apparently striving to break away from fellowship with the ocean of which they form a part, and with which they cannot help but blend. As I gaze on the restless, surging waters I think of Society. That, too, is a troubled ocean, bounded by sandy or rocky coast lines of laws and institutions, against which human beings hurtle themselves with many a moan, and from which rise turbulent and yeasty factions threatening each other with destruction, pursuing each other mercilessly, engulfing each other pitilessly, and seeming as though they would disown the common nature which they share and which asserts itself in them all. This comparison might be continued almost indefinitely. As the wide sea is a unit in its depths, though torn by winds and divided on its surface, and as it has expanses of calm as well as of storm; and as it has currents that counteract each other and tides that advance and retreat; and as it has voices of agony responding to cruel torments of the tempest, and other voices of needless complaining when its whitest waves beat gently upon the beach,—so, likewise, in Society. There, also, oneness of interest underlies diversities of action; there antagonisms sweep onward side by side or cross each other's course; there sweet seasons of peace and prosperity are enjoyed, and again times of conflict and adversity are encountered; there, also, is progress, and then retrogression and progress once more; and there, too, are cries, shrieks and repinings, wrung from suffering thousands by the hand of oppression, and wailings and murmurings unwarranted and unjustifiable.

Of late much attention has been given to social problems, but not more than they deserve, for they are the vital questions of the age. To their earnest consideration I have devoted for several years the time that could be spared from professional pursuits, and in this volume present the results of my observation, reading and reflection. Frequently have I lectured on these subjects, and some traces of the platform will be found in their treatment. This defect, as some critics may regard it, was partly unavoidable, as the habit of direct address cultivated by one who speaks much in public cannot readily be overcome. But on the other hand, it may be said by way of apology, if apology is needed, this style possesses some advantages, especially in the direction of freedom, familiarity and personal appeal, and I felt that I ought not to deprive myself altogether of its charm and power.

It may be of interest to the reader to learn in advance what is the governing idea of the book which he is invited to peruse. In very brief terms it can be stated. I am a firm believer in American liberty, in contradistinction to the theories of liberty current in France and Germany, and I am persuaded that social amelioration can only be promoted by the faithful application of its principles. My aim has been to define these principles, to compare their working with those of other systems, to show how they are related to religion and education, to portray the evils which result from their violation and the vicious causes which hinder their beneficent action, and to make plain what reforms are needed to render them effective in dealing with existing and perplexing problems. It may be permitted me to add, that in discharging my self-imposed task I have not sought after scenic and sensational originality, nor to invent strange remedies for the sake of inventing. Mine the humbler ambition expressed by Robert Browning:

> I like to use the thing I find,
> Rather than strive at unfound novelty:
> I make the best of the old, nor try for new.

This book has already passed through one fire, being partially destroyed in the great conflagration which wrecked the magnificent buildings occupied by its publishers, and it has been restored to shape with much labor and difficulty. But for this disaster it would have appeared last June. And now another fire awaits it—that of the critics. If, however, they shall treat it as generously as they have other volumes from my pen, and if not more of it shall be charred with censure than went up in the flames on that dreadful night in May, I shall not murmur at the ordeal. But whatever may be their judgment, I have honestly worked—

> With powers appointed me, since powers denied
> Concern me nothing.

GEORGE C. LORIMER.

OCEAN HOUSE, SWAMPSCOTT, Mass., August, 1886.

I.

THE SOLIDARITY OF SOCIETY.

Each creature holds an insular point in space:
Yet what man stirs a finger, breathes a sound,
But all the multitudinous beings round,
In all the countless worlds, with time and place
For their conditions, down to the central base,
Thrill, haply, in vibration and rebound,
Life answering life across the vast profound,
In full antiphony.

—*Mrs. Browning.*

Be Hate that fruit, or Love that fruit,
It forwards the general deed of Man;
And each of the many helps to recruit
The life of the race by a general plan,
Each living his own to boot.

—*Robert Browning.*

SOCIETY has been called "the standing miracle of this world." Its wonderful indestructibility would seem to warrant this representation. Variable in many respects as the surface of the earth, in other respects it is as permanent. Generations with their crimes, their ambitions, their sorrows, and despair have passed into oblivion, and new generations, with perishable innocence, joy, and hope have followed, only to vanish as ignominiously as their predecessors; but Society, like nature's "solemn temples" and "the great globe itself," though assailed by numerous foes, has resisted decay and death. It may be compared to a light-house shedding its rays over the advancing and receding tides of men and of races, which no billows have

been able to submerge and no lightnings have succeeded in wrecking. Though mutable in form, being plastic and versatile, and though frequently modified and diversified in structure, it has remained, and yet remains, in its essential features stable, persistent and unyielding. Shaken it has often been, but never subverted. Political revolutions have dashed their lava-like waves against it, or have yawned like earthquakes to engulf it; fanatical conspiracies have threatened to overwhelm it, and dreamy illusions have attempted to undermine it; but, though at times its existence has been problematical and its preservation marvelous, and though its character has suffered from these violent and subtle antagonists, it has never in reality finally succumbed. In the long run it has always triumphed. And if it has withstood the disintegrating tyranny and licentiousness of Nero the vicious, and of Louis the Great, with all the other disreputable creatures who have filled the thrones of the world; and if it has victoriously combated the disorganizing lawlessness of Marat the feline, and of Robespierre the "strait-laced," with all their attendant *sans culottes;* and if it has survived the misleading visions presented in "The Eternal Gospel" of Joachim de Fiore, "the Utopia" of More, "The Civitas Solis" of Campanella, "The Oceana" of Harrington, and "The Salent" of Fenelon, we may well believe that its perpetuity is assured to the future. Society has been, is now, and doubtless will be, forevermore; or at least until the general day of doom, if ever such a day shall break with annihilating horrors on a panic-stricken universe.

This continuity is, apparently, deeply grounded both in the nature of man and in the providence of God. Plato contends in his *Republic*, and in his dialogue entitled *Protagorus*, as Aristotle does in his *Politics*, that there is in all men affinity for the social state. Locke also argues that God has made them not only with an inclination and under

a necessity to have fellowship with those of their own kind, but has furnished them with language, which is the great instrument and common tie of brotherhood. And Ferguson has confirmed these testimonies by showing that "mankind have always wandered or settled, agreed or quarreled in troops and companies." Likewise the Frenchman, Alfred Fouillee (*La Science Sociale p.* 421.), maintains that the same law which produced the worlds and the constellations, produced also human society. His words are: "*Les mêmes lois qui ont produit les mondes et les constellations produisent donc les societes humaines, avec cette différénce que ce qui était dans les uns lumiére extérieure et mouvement fatal devient dans les autres lumiere interieure conscience et mouvement volontaire.*" The discrimination he here draws does not detract in the least from the conviction that both domains have proceeded from a necessary and irreversible law. Indeed, history conclusively proves that the social instinct—the *societatis appetitus* of Grotius—is strong, that it impels the race to combine and organize, and that when such combinations are impaired or deranged it inevitably restores them in the old forms or in fresh ones. Thus then, Society is not artificial in its origin, but natural and Divine; and, therefore, as long as man remains man, and as long as God rules over the world, we may confidently expect it in some shape to exist. But in what shape? We know that its spirit, institutions, methods, and manners have undergone frequent changes, and that it has never yet attained to such a degree of perfection as to dispense with the service of reformers. Evils have ever afflicted it, and unquestionably there is still room for indefinite improvement. How it shall be molded, how fashioned and ordered, that in the future it may more adequately and beneficently discharge its functions than in the past, is the vital question of the hour. To its solution all kinds of writers have directed, and are still directing

their energies; and we only need mention the names of Mazade, Lassalle, Proudhon, Karl Marx, Elise Reclus, Bakounine, Henry George, William Godwin Moody, William Morris, Owen, J. Stuart Mill, Fawcett, Cairnes, Thornton, Laveleye, Thorold Rogers, Carlyle, Ruskin, Herbert Spencer, Maurice, Kingsley, Thomas Hughes, Renan, and a host of others, to gain an idea of the wide range and varied character of the discussion now taking place. These men, and thousands of the purest and most intelligent everywhere, sympathize with them, are painfully impressed by the inequalities, sufferings and apparent hopelessness of modern times. They raise their voices against wrongs, oppressions, corruptions and stupidities of the age, and suggest as remedies schemes, more or less radical, such as the Phalsterianism of Fourier, the Peoples Banks of Proudhon, the Anarchism of Bakounine, the Land Nationalization of George, and the six-hour law of Moody; or they indulge in fierce invectives, or melancholy retrospects, and gloomy forebodings, such as distinguish the wearisome and endless complaints of Carlyle and Ruskin. But however they may differ from each other in views, they seem to be one in spirit. They are all seeking the true welfare of Society, and are alike striving to rouse all peoples to fresh endeavors in behalf of its deliverance from the curses which now disfigure and debase its character. Proudhon would classify them together as "Socialists," and, adopting his interpretation of the term, we are content to do the same. They constitute in reality a party believing in social progress, and laboring for its achievement, in contradistinction from those who are satisfied with things as they are, and who question whether improvement is possible. Proudhon, after the *Journées de Juin* in 1848, when interrogated by a magistrate, said that he had been contemplating "the sublime horrors of the cannonade." "But," inquired the official, "are you not then a Social-

ist?" "Yes, assuredly, I am a Socialist." "What then is Socialism?" asked his examiner. "Socialism," replied Proudhon, "is any aspiration toward the amelioration of society." "If this be the case, then," the magistrate answered, "we are all Socialists." "That is precisely my opinion," quietly responded Proudhon. In this sense then we are warranted in applying the name to the multitude, a multitude ever increasing, of those who seek in some way to abate the evils which burden and afflict humanity. We know that this is not the technical meaning of the word, and we are aware that it is employed in a narrower and more objectionable way; but at the same time we cannot think of any other that as fittingly characterizes the growing party which, however it may be split into factions and may be divided into extremests and moderates, is intent on social amelioration and advancement and has hearty hope of ultimate success.

In the ranks of this party the writer of these pages has been enrolled for some years, and still earnestly desires the triumph of the cause it advocates. With this end in view he presumes to contribute the present volume. He is not a pessimist. While the sufferings of the race are great, he does not regard them as being as terrible as in former ages; and while there are fearful wrongs to be rectified, he does not think that they are as gigantic as some from which the world has already been delivered. He is not blind to the woeful and awful sights and sounds of modern civilization, and yet he sings:

> The good of ancient times let others state
> I think it lucky I was born so late.

He is not infatuated with yesterday, neither does he unduly extol nor depreciate to-day, nor does he doubt the promise of a better to-morrow. But he believes if that morrow ever dawns it will be through the faithful and earnest en-

deavors of those who, seeing abuses, injustice and corruption, seek by tongue, pen, and hand their utter extermination. With this end before him he has written. He confesses at the outset to a strong bias on the side of the poor, the illiterate, and despairing. It is their cause he would particularly plead. While he dare not go as far as Basil, and say "The rich are thieves," or, with John Chrysostom, assert that they are "brigands," and that "everything ought to be in common," he yet believes that the excessively affluent under present social conditions have too much power, too many exclusive privileges, and, in some respects, constitute the most dangerous class of the "dangerous classes" of a community. He has found it impossible to keep from his mind such questions as perplexed Bossuet when he wrote: "Why should one fortunate mortal live in abundance, able to satisfy his every little useless fancy, while another, every whit his equal, cannot maintain his poor family, or even procure for them sufficient food to allay the gnawing pangs of hunger?" How frequently has this and similar queries agitated and confused mankind; and how natural, when they have been considered, for thought and speech to champion the interests of the wretched, even to the extent of doing injustice to the favored. This extreme partisanship is wrong. The writer of these words is fully conscious of this; and yet, when cruel inequalities force themselves on his attention, he finds himself falling into it. Perhaps it is unavoidable. Certainly the wealthy have defenders enough; and after all, it is not their condition Social Science seeks to improve, but that of the toiling, struggling masses. God knows I would not, if I may be allowed to speak in the first person, willingly do them any wrong. But I am honest enough to avow my sympathies. They are on the side of the lowly and poor. I would lighten their burdens, I would dry their tears, I would diminish their sorrows, increase their

joys, multiply their privileges, stimulate their ambition, and save them from vice, ignorance, and despair, and from the equally fatal political and social illusions by which false friends are luring them to ruin. The more I think on their deplorable condition, the more intently do I find myself passionately inquiring with Elliot:

When wilt Thou save the people?
O, God of Mercy, when?
The people, Lord, the people!
Not thrones and crowns, but men!
Flowers of thy heart, O God, are they!
Let them not pass like weeds away,
Their heritage a sunless day!
God save the people.

And now, as I commit to the public my reflections on the Principles, Practices, and Problems of Society, in which I have pointed out the elevation that may be reached, the prosperity that may be mastered, and the freedom that may be attained, may I not hope for a careful reading and a candid judgment? I have tried to put my soul in my book, and now, as it goes forth on its mission, I cannot but imitate Proudhon, and invoke the Divine blessing to attend it. Nor can language of mine as adequately represent the spirit in which I have written, or the deep emotions by which I have been moved, or the dependence I have felt on the Unseen Being for success in my undertaking, as that of this same Proudhon, who closed his remarkable *Memoire on Property* with these striking and sublime petitions:

O, God of Liberty! God of Equality! Thou God, who hast placed in my heart the sentiment of justice before my reason comprehended it, hear my ardent prayer. Thou hast formed my thought, thou hast directed my studies, thou hast separated my spirit from curiosity and my heart from attachment, in order that I should publish the truth before the master and the slave. I have spoken as thou hast given me the power and talent; it remains for thee to complete

thy work. Thou knowest whether I may have sought my interest or glory. O God of Liberty! may my memory perish if humanity may but be free; if I may but see in my obscurity the people finally instructed, if noble instructors but enlighten it, if disinterested hearts but guide it! * * * Then the great and the small, the rich and the poor, will unite in one ineffable fraternity; and all together, chanting a new hymn, will re-erect thy altar, O God of liberty and equality.

Dr. Draper, in his *Conflict Between Religion and Science*, ascribes the wonderful changes of modern times to an extraordinary development of "individualism" in the sixteenth century. He finds its embodiment in a sturdy German monk — Luther — who asserted its rights under theological forms; and if he had searched farther he would have found it being clothed in the robes of philosophy by another German — Leibnitz. Great indeed was this revolution. It is well known that the old governments were essentially paternal in character, just as Russia is today. They regarded all citizens as members of the body politic, and the King or Emperor as the head, the duty of the one being to submit, and the right of the other being to rule and judge. The chief legislated for his subjects, determined their religious faith for them, prescribed their conduct, fixed their wages, and even went so far as to regulate their food and apparel. When Bossuet, under Louis XIV., taught that "Kings are gods, and share in a manner the Divine independence;" and when Hobbes sanctioned the notion of unlimited sovereignty, it is evident no bounds could be set to governmental powers and demands; and that, as in Peru, the Inca "was the source from which everything flowed," and as in Dahome all men are slaves to the monarch, so the personality of the citizen must have been ignored and practically nullified by the organized tyranny of the absolute authority which these celebrated authors approved. Where it reigned, freedom of thought,

freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, with all other natural and inalienable rights, were necessarily treated with disdain and contempt. Traces of this principle are still to be found in some of the most civilized nations of Europe; and a new tendency in the same direction appears in Communism, which, substituting the State for the king, would have the individual owned by the former instead of the latter; for, as Herbert Spencer teaches, his personal liberty must be sacrificed in proportion as his mental, moral and material welfare becomes the care of the Commonwealth. But while remnants of antique "Paternalism" survive, and while efforts are being made to revive it in a more popular form, the revolt from it which distinguished the overthrow of feudalism, the rise of constitutional government in England, and the revolutions in America and France, was too determined and radical for a reactionary movement to promise encouraging progress. The peril and evil of our times, particularly in this country, are rather of an opposite character.

Emancipation from the political and social *régime* of the past necessarily carried with it enlarged, and, perhaps, exaggerated notions regarding the importance of the individual. Hence, we hear little else to day than cries, protestations, and declarations about personal rights: rights of property, rights of conscience, rights of labor, rights of capital, rights of women, rights of children, rights of trade, and other rights too innumerable for specific mention here, which are being so highly extolled as to overshadow the sense of duty, fill the air with the loud echo of their demands, and are bringing classes, sexes, and pursuits into deadly hostility. In a word, modern liberty has so powerfully stimulated individualism that it has actually grown into egoism, and the result is intense sordidness, comparative disregard for the welfare of others, and the supremacy of business maxims subversive of that Gospel which, accord-

ing to Sissy Jupe, reveals the first principle of Political Economy in the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." Even the benevolence of the age is largely tainted by this morbid spirit. The philosophers in several instances have contributed to this drift from the fair ideal of brotherhood, and of brotherly sacrifice, which it was Christ's purpose to actualize among men. Hobbes maintains that in doing good to others our ultimate aim is really to do good to ourselves, and that, consequently, what we call love for others is simply love for oneself. Mandeville and Helvetius adopt a similar view; and it has so far permeated current thought that much of our philanthropy is merely a refined species of selfishness, a method of gratifying ourselves by gratifying somebody else. The greatness, the profitableness, the loveliness, the luxury of kindness, generosity and sympathy are insisted on too strongly for the sweets of real disinterestedness to be tasted by our generation. In a very large number of cases pecuniary aid can only be obtained for the poor, or for humanitarian movements and public enterprises by a covert appeal to the vanity or conceit of the donors. They are usually flattered extensively, and sometimes excessively; their desire for personal happiness is skillfully excited; their craving for the approval and applause of their fellow-beings is judiciously nursed and fondled, and they are thus persuaded into doing what they would otherwise leave unattempted. Others have natures peculiarly susceptible. They are easily affected to pain by recitals of sorrows and sufferings, and often extend a helping hand more to allay their own stormful feelings than to minister to calm elsewhere. As in benevolence, so in right-living, self-interest is not merely acknowledged to be the ruling principle, but is gloried in as the supreme law which all are bound to obey. Integrity, temperance, and faithfulness to obligations are commended as contributing to the welfare and peace of those

who regard them, and, therefore, as preferable to their opposites. The policy of right-doing, not the rightness of right-doing, is uppermost in the majority of minds, and practical ethics are reduced to the low level of a scheme to check, balance and adjust the operations of practical selfishness. Manifestly, Hobbes is in the ascendant; but, notwithstanding the unhappy prevalence of his theory, it is base and unsound. It is possible, whatever his school of philosphy may say to the contrary, to be moved to right deeds and good deeds by higher and nobler considerations than its teachings allow. As Bishop Butler has shown in his own vigorous way, "If sympathy with another is to be construed into self-love because it is I who feel it, then by the same rule my admiration and praise of another must be resolved into self-praise and self-admiration, and I am the whole time delighted with myself, to wit, with my own thoughts and feelings, while I pretend to be delighted with another." Assuredly deep feeling in behalf of suffering may arise without any thought of self, just as in the case of true homage to genius; but it may be enough to say in reply to every elaborate defense of this calculating morality, that agreeableness and usefulness are not ethical conceptions at all. What a man does merely because it is agreeable or advantageous, common sense decides is not necessarily virtuous. Such a basis of conduct tends to subvert morality, and hence the rapid spread of insincerity, heartlessness, charlatanry and corruption, during recent years. And while it thus pollutes the springs of social life it fosters lawlessness, rudeness and anarchy in the State. Individualism developed into windy, blatant, self-infatuated egoism, brooks but little control on the part of constituted authorities; and recognizing no personage greater than self, and no obligations higher than those which impel self to secure first and last the interests of self, it takes care to do as little as possible for the general welfare of the community. It is

not only its own pope, it is also its own president and chief-justice as well. Respect, reverence, obedience, are virtues it never cultivates, and without these civic order is difficult, if not impossible. Carlyle, has said, "It is not by mechanism, but by religion; not by self-interest, but by loyalty, that men are governed or governable," and we are therefore warranted in expressing apprehensions that unless the present abnormal growth of individualism can be arrested we shall wake up at last to scenes of strife and suffering as terrible and horrible as any which have disgraced the annals of our race.

To avert these possible calamities, an effort should be made before it is too late to arouse Society to a distinct and intense consciousness of its solidarity. By this we do not mean to advocate the opposite extreme, the undue depreciation of individualism, or to recommend that it be superseded by excessive government control ; but that the close and permanent relations between the unit and the totality of mankind should be pointed out, and their bearings for good and evil be clearly and sharply displayed. We admit that we are employing a term to express this thought of very doubtful character. The French, from whose language it is derived, usually inscribe it on the banners of Socialism to denote its distinctive principles ; but we do not adopt the word for any such purpose. We have not in mind any form of Society when we suggest that it contains an antidote to the mischievous egoism of our day. Real and true "solidarity" is not an affair of state-craft, not an artificial arrangement to equalize the citizens of a Commonwealth; but is rather that mysterious, natural principle which weaves one human personality in with another, and which blends, combines, and almost consolidates them together. The fact is, inexplicable links unite the separate and separable members of our race, and its aggregate is more than a formal mechanical organization of

multitudinous parts. There is such a necessary, vital, inner, and spiritual coalescence between its members, such an indivisibility of interests and indissolvableness of relations, that its wholeness is as one huge body, having a common consciousness and a common soul. The Apostle Paul employs this figure when referring to a special and particular fellowship: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ;" and "whether one member suffer all the members suffer with it, or one member be honored all the members rejoice with it—" a representation as applicable to Society as it is to that segment of which the church is composed. To vary the illustration, individuality may be compared to the distinct waves that rise and fall while social unity may be likened to the undivided ocean of which the billows form a part; it may be compared to the stars that shed radiance on the earth, while social wholeness may be likened to the light from whence they derive their common lustre; the first is as the leaves and branches of a tree, the second is as the tree itself; the first is as the wheat and tares, the second is as the roots inextricably intertwined and interlaced.

Of the reality of the doctrine thus defined, and of its preëminent importance, there can hardly be any question. Let us not forget that we of the present are creations of the past. What we are, whether for weal or woe, is largely due to the generations gone. Our roots are in former times, and the direction of our growth is determined by influences that blow from the realms of the dead. If the doctrine of the conservation of force is true, that no physical energy is wasted and no material element is destructible, but only convertible, and transformable, then it must follow that no thought, idea, or endeavor is perishable. And if the intellectual and spiritual forces of the world are as durable as the physical, being only susceptible

to modifications and transmutations, then we who live in this age have been shaped and directed by the inexhaustible energies of ages ended. We are thus identified with humanity from the very beginning of its existence. Not all our art or skill can dissever the connection. Try as we may to rend the tie, we shall still find it to be impossible. In vain shall we strive to extricate ourselves from the past. In our thinking, feeling, planning, working, it will in spite of us obtrude itself, and at times will perplex us to decide whether we really belong to this era or to one lying in the morning twilight of history. But not only are we subject to influences whose origin is hidden in the remote antiquity, we also inherit from our ancestors taints and tendencies, mental and bodily peculiarities and characteristics. "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Yes, the moral as well as physical current flows from sire to son. In that mysterious chamber where life is elaborated, the likeness of the parent, with more or less accuracy, is transmitted to the child, as the face of a man is imprinted on the photographer's plate, hidden in the darkness of the camera. Each birth is as the restoration of some old portrait; a process that revives faded colors, and that once more fixes the outlines of features that had well nigh become indistinct. Whatever theoretical objections we may entertain to this law, it is as unquestionable as the law of gravitation. The hypothesis of the evolutionists derives its greatest degree of probability from this certainty. Heredity underlies the reasoning both of Darwin and Spencer, and without it their conclusions would lack even the shadow of a foundation. We need hardly remind you that the Bible confirms this view, and in the clearest terms insists on the transmissibility not merely of physical, but of moral qualities as well. Corruption, scrofulousness, and general viciousness may be in the blood; but they may as truly be in the spirit.

Predisposition to righteousness, devoutness of soul, or mental aptness for particular pursuits may at an early period discover itself in the child, and not unfrequently be traced to its progenitors. And what, as George Eliot has so well argued, can be more reasonable? For

> Shall the trick of nostril and of lips
> Descend through generations, and the soul
> That moves within our frame like God in worlds—
> Convulsing, urging, melting, withering—
> Imprint no record, leave no documents
> Of her great history?

There can be but one answer to the question. If the doctrine of descent is true at all, the spiritual must be as transmissible as the physical; and if we in the present are the receptacles of the past, and if the future cannot but receive the present, then is one generation indeed bound up in all the others, and the solidarity of humanity is a very real and a very solemn fact.

Additional considerations must, we think, increase the force of this conclusion. Take the race at any one period of its existence, say our own, and observe how close the relations are that unite its myriad members, and how the well-being of one is interwoven with the prosperity of all. Dr. South wisely said: "If indeed a man could be wicked and a villain to himself alone, the mischief would be so much the more tolerable." But that is impossible. As the apostle wrote, "no man liveth to himself," so no man sinneth to himself alone. His waywardness involves the innocent, compromises and afflicts those who have faithfully reproved him for his course. The drunkard impoverishes his family, the gambler disgraces it, and the criminal brings upon it that ban which oftentimes is so undeserved, and which is yet enforced so mercilessly. Like a stone falling in the mire, that besplashes the unfortunate bystander, the descent of the good into evil bespat-

ters his relatives and friends. Their garments are befouled with his befoulment; and the shame which he has merited they frequently feel more keenly than he does or can. The only relief to this dark fact is that on the other side the operation of this law is equally apparent. "If one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it;" if "one sinner does much harm," one righteous man does much good. He who wins for himself an honorable name cannot, if he would, retain its lustre to himself. It will irradiate those who are allied to him, and if it does not do so irresistibly his friends will take good care to place themselves in the way of its brightness. If you want to know how numerous your relatives are, acquire fame or wealth, or obtain the nomination to high political office, and you will speedily be amazed at the extent of your family. "What! will the line stretch out to the crack of doom?" I can readily conceive a successful aspirant for presidential dignity exclaiming, as his eye wanders despairingly over the multitude who claim some degree of fellowship with his blood. But, even apart from such self-evident selfishness, the nobility achieved by one is shared by many. Father and mother feel the triumph of their son as though it were their own, and carry themselves with a prouder air because it has been won; and many a child of renowned parentage rests with serene satisfaction on the laurels wherewith his house is crowned, nor makes the least endeavor to increase its glory. Even entire communities have a sense of elevation when one of their number performs some notable feat or makes some remarkable discovery. We rejoice to belong to the race whose history is distinguished by the names of such men as Hampden, Shakspeare, Washington, Franklin, Morse, Bryant, and Stephenson. The realization of their greatness somehow ministers to our own. They seem to be part of ourselves,

as though we lived in their life, and as though in some inexplicable way our being merged itself in theirs.

Have you ever explored the significance of our interdependence in labor? Many workers are indispensable to every important result, whether it be social, religious, political, or mechanical. There is no invention that can be ascribed solely to one mind, no revolution and no reform that can be credited to one individual, just as there is no community whose welfare is separable from diversity. We are in the habit of recognizing some conspicuous person as the author of important movements, but there is never one who deserves to be lifted up so high that in fixing on him eyes of admiration his co-workers should be overlooked. But for them he never would have succeeded, as but for him all their toil would or might have been in vain. Mrs. Browning writes:

> 'Twill employ
> Seven men, they say, to make a perfect pin:
> Who makes the head, content to miss the point,
> Who makes the point, agreed to leave the joint;
> And if a man should cry, "I want a pin,
> And I must make it straightway, head and point,"
> His wisdom is not worth the pin he wants.
> Seven men to a pin, and not a man too much.

And how many for a newspaper, a railroad, a steamboat, a factory, an invention, a discovery, a reform, or a revolution? How many to direct, sustain, and shape that complicated machinery called civilization? One industry is dependent on another, and "the eye" of the inventor "can not say to the hand" of the mechanic, "I have no need of thee;" "nor again the head" of the thinker "to the feet" of the toiler, "I have no need of thee; nay, much more, those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary." The writer can not say to the printer, I have no need of thee; nor the manufacturer

to the producer, I have no need of thee; nor the architect to the builder, I have no need of thee; nor the jeweler to the miner, I have no need of thee; nor the miner to the smelter, I have no need of thee; nor the merchant to the trader, I have no need of thee; nor the citizen to the statesman, I have no need of thee; nor the navigator to the astronomer, I have no need of thee. Nor, indeed, can any calling, however high, say to any, however low, I have no need of thee; for they are all so mortised, dovetailed, and sutured into each other, so ingrafted and intertwisted, that the suspension of the one would jeopardize the rest. And if to this interdependence we add the reality of sympathy, whose waves like the currents of atmosphere and seas which course about our globe, reviving and refreshing, flow from heart to heart, and even from land to land, making all sorrows common and all sufferings personal, while they bear on their bosom strength and comfort, the doctrine of solidarity will be so fully confirmed that henceforward it will become a vital part of our every-day working creed.

To us it is singular that any person should permit ideas of independence, or the institutions of freedom, or anything else to obscure the inexorable reality of this principle in social relations. Yet, as we have already intimated, nothing in our times is more common. Many people who acknowledge its abstract truth are inexcusably blind to its actual operations in the concrete, and seem to proceed on the supposition that it is not practically applicable to the welfare and advancement of humanity. At least they justify the suspicion that they believe themselves exempt from personal allegiance to the law of solidarity, and may tamper with it, and disregard it, without injury to community or detriment to themselves. There is no delusion more fatal, and none that ought to be more unsparingly rebuked. Consider for a moment how utterly impossible it is for any of us to evade all responsibility for the condition of

Society, and how absolutely futile the hope that we can live in its fellowship and yet exercise no influence on its destiny. It is not something outside of ourselves, something from which we can be separated, our dreaming to the contrary notwithstanding. We may retire to our chamber and read accounts of royal pageants, of kingly splendors, of Vanderbilt balls, of expensive opera festivals, and moralizing, exclaim, "Oh! the pomps and vanities of Society!" as though we had no earthly concern in these brilliant movements; or we may meditate on political struggles, fraudulent elections, rioting in the streets, battlings in the east or west, outrages committed on the innocent, and wrongs and cruelties perpetrated on the defenceless, and indignantly murmur against the awful things that go on in Society, as though we were unharmed by them and necessarily unblamable for them; or we may reflect on the sufferings of millions, their poverty, anguish, and despair, and with tears in our eyes and sorrow in our heart, declaim against the heartlessness of Society, as though we could not under any circumstances be as heartless as the rest. But this frontier line, after all, is purely imaginary; there is no such abyss between ourselves and Society as we suppose. There is not a change in its affairs, nor an evil tolerated, nor a vice defended, nor a right resisted, nor a good assailed, in which we are not interested, and for which we are not more or less accountable. When the degraded and reckless classes are neglected, and their unclean habits and depraved conduct breed malaria and death, are we not exposed to peril, and if we fall a victim to their irregularities may we not simply be paying the penalty of our selfish disregard of their welfare? Their excesses and corruptions may murder as surely as Cain who slew his brother Abel; but in this instance, Abel himself may be largely responsible for the crime. A low moral sense, combined with ignorance and passion, may seek to avenge its real or fancied wrongs by

applying dynamite, not only to public buildings, but to the inequalities which divide, hoping in this way to explode social order and blow up the very throne of Providence. We may feel no concern in these violent proceedings, may smile complacently on their partial successes, and yet they may ultimately shatter and consume both our property and life. Thus, then, whether we like it or not, and whether we are conscious of it or not, the law of solidarity asserts itself in the practical affairs of the world, and stubbornly insists that neither human happiness nor prosperity can be realized apart from its recognition, appliance and general utilization.

The opinion prevails, and we shall not controvert it at this point, if at all, that there must always be aristocracies of blood as in England, of culture as in Germany, or of money as in America. Whatever may be said in favor of them separately or together, they are alike open to the objection that they are usually self-conceited and self-contained, and being exempt from many of the ills of life, feel exempt also from many of its obligations. The feudal barons resisted every encroachment on their oppressive privileges; the medieval priests would never lessen their exactions, though multitudes were on the verge of starvation; the French nobility of a hundred years ago resented taxation and pleaded their ancient rights; and in the same spirit the upper classes of today are unwilling to deny themselves various indulgences and gratifications for the sake of the people. Now as in the past, it is almost a gospel with them that every man should look after himself first, last, and altogether, and should never hesitate to build up his own fortune even at the expense of his neighbors. Indeed they are so self-satisfied that they come to look on iniquities and wrongs perpetrated by themselves as totally distinct in character from similar deeds committed by the unthinking and degraded. Augustus very likely saw no injustice in his murderous hate

against Anthony, when having divided the world with him and Lepidus, he desired his death that he might reign over it alone; Charlemagne doubtless palliated his cruel conduct when he shut up his brother Carloman in a cloister, and cut off the heads of all Saxons who were taller than his sword was long that he might thus destroy Whitikkind; and when Rufus revolted, and Louis XI. rebelled against his father, and when Richelieu made effective his policy at the block in the Place de Gréve, and when Mazarine proved faithless to the exiled Charles, and when Louis XV. rioted in the *Parc-au-cerfs*, they all unquestionably had fine reasons and smooth extenuations for their villanies, massacres and pollutions, regarding them almost as virtues, and not in any way to be identified with the turbulence of the Roman plebs, the low and vulgar vices of the serfs, or the bloody and heartless crimes of the Parisian *sans culottes*. So is it still. Many capitalists and corporations, Shylock-like, must have their exact pound of flesh though it drain the last drop of blood from the laboring classes. They demand enormous profits and build up colossal fortunes at the expense of the toiling millions. Experience proves that the plethoric coffers and palatial palaces of the small minority would be impossibilities but for the impoverishment of the great majority, and this condition of things indicates pretty clearly the existence of manifold cruelties and wrongs. Horrible and startling contrasts confront us on every hand. The splendid mansion and the poor-house, the gorgeous and useless club and the tramp's wretched lodgings, the wealthy distiller and the pauperized thousands who yield his princely income, the affluent manufacturer and the beggared and disheartened throngs on whose sweat and blood he fattens, all go to show that injustice prevails,and that some men are driving in the spirit of a Tamerlane, over the hopes, happiness and honor of helpless humanity to their golden goal. Commercial leaders do not always hesitate to avail them-

selves of their power to "corner" provisions and other necessaries of life, though they know that the masses of the people must feel more keenly than the few the results of their so-called legitimate "operations." They frequently derange values, break up the business of their small competitors, cut down wages that they may preserve their own incomes, and carry wide-spread misery and devastation throughout the land. Their insatiable greed robs the laborer of his own, deprives him of his Sabbath, draws him away from church, and degrades him to the level of a serf. Nay more, their grasping oppressions necessarily breed indolence, intemperance, and ignorance, and crowd our jails with criminals, and our asylums with imbeciles. Yet these capitalists and merchant princes are generally unconscious of any real departure from the divine law which should govern the relations of man to man, and are so self-satisfied with their own virtue that they have assurance enough to build cathedrals and endow theological seminaries with the money they have wrung from the toil of the poor. They offer beautiful pleas, and cogent arguments in defense of their conduct; cogent and beautiful to them, but quite otherwise to those who are their unfortunate victims. If they were not to act as they do, others would, and therefore they cannot be wrong. Such is their admirable logic. The rights of capital and its sanctity are all important, and therefore they ought to accumulate it, and keep it at any sacrifice. Such is their conclusive reasoning. Moreover, are they not to reap the fruit of their intelligence, forethought, smartness and acuteness, because others cannot rival them? Such is their unanswerable Socratic method. Thus a Charlemagne might reply to his imprisoned brother in his cell, or a Richelieu when explaining the beneficence of the headsman's ax, or a Louis XV. when expounding to his grumbling subjects the moral superiority of a royal seraglio to a

public bagnio. But however the conduct of these money-lords may be viewed by others, in their own estimation it is not to be classed with the villainous deeds of strikers, with the rapacious demands of trades unions, and with the rascally endeavors of coöperative organizations to tax capital for the advantage of the producer. No; they are not like these vulgar *prolétaires* and *roturiers*. They may not be perfect, but they imagine they are of finer clay than their despised neighbors, and certainly never sin as grossly and abominably as the Yahoo's and Fellahs of the workshops do. As Holland once wrote, their sins are to them as their fancy dogs, "poodle sins—with silky white hair—sins held in by a social collar and a religious ribbon—that bark at good honest dogs while their eyes are red with the devil in them."

Notwithstanding these fine distinctions some of us are obliged to confess that we can perceive no very marked difference between the iniquity and injustice of an aristocrat and of a plebian. Why Jay Gould, coining money by "fiduciary harlotry," should be regarded as a very worthy individual indeed, and his gardeners, clamoring for an advance of wages to $1.50 a day, should be set down as very dangerous and worthless characters, we never could quite understand: but there is one thing that we do see and cannot fail to see—it is that the selfish political economy of the rich is as disastrous to the best interests of Society, and their extravagance and viciousness as demoralizing, as the violence, the socialistic agitations, and even the stupid dynamite policy of the poor. The proof of this comes to us from every side. Newspapers write of a "new feudalism," which means as well a "new serfdom," and impartial students of their times not only show how the masses are being pauperized, but how they are suffering morally and physically. Samuel Royce and Henry George have not overcolored the picture of "man's inhumanity to man;" but even if we doubt their

testimony a little reflection will convince the most skeptical, the principle of solidarity being true, that the influence of our parvenu patricians and mercenary magnificoes, charged as it is through and through with shabbiness, faithlessness, meanness, knavishness and heartlessness, must inevitably be pernicious and mischievous. As streams flow down hills and submerge the plains, and as heavy lowering clouds descend and envelop earth, so the conduct and example of the so-called upper classes must invariably affect the lower. Thus we are not surprised when princes of the blood and peers of the realm in Europe make light of marriage vows and invent euphonious names to disguise adultery, and do not blush to appear uproariously intoxicated in public, that the common people should fail to perceive anything very heinous in beating a wife or in becoming crazily drunk. Formerly we simple republicans desired to know the nobles of England; but of late so many disreputable things have been related of them in their own journals that our self-respect would hardly allow us now to make their acquaintance; but, what is even worse than their own indecency, they are breeding indecency all around them. Mathew Arnold, if we remember right, has spoken of them as "materialized," and has added that the middle classes are "vulgarized" and the lower "brutalized." If he had substituted "sensualized" for "materialized" he would have come nearer the truth, and would have furnished an explanation of the moral deterioration of the humbler orders. But our own gentry do not seem to be much better. In the highest circles of Washington two winters ago during an elegant reception a brawl occurred in the dressing room, and an American gentleman (?) struck an unoffending foreign representative; and another at a fashionable gathering was so tipsy that he actually rested his head on the shoulder of a fat dowager and went to sleep there; and yet we affect amazement at the constantly recurring bar-room fights and the maudlin helplessness of clerks and

mechanics. Distinguished men, like Roscoe Conkling, we are told by reliable journals, patronize and enjoy pugilistic encounters, and if this is the case we can readily understand the difficulties in the way of their suppression. A young lady related recently that in answering advertisements for office-work of various kinds in Chicago she had not found one which failed to have behind it an insulting proposal; and another stated that after a hard week of sewing in a large dry-goods establishment she was handed two dollars; nor was she incompetent, for subsequently she obtained employment elsewhere at twelve dollars a week. Yet we wonder that the social evil increases; that women are driven to vicious courses, and that young men are blindly led by them into all kinds of dissipation; but, after all, there is no occasion for surprise. There is hardly any mystery about these sad departures from purity and rectitude. As fire kindles fire, and as contagion spreads disease, so by an unalterable providential arrangement the example of the high and prominent contaminates the lowly and obscure. However "blue" may be the blood, and however exclusive the life and supercilious and purse-proud the bearing of the former, they are so bound, allied and related to the latter that they can no more refrain from swaying, influencing and molding them, than the mountain ranges can cease to pour their floods and the *débris* of the rocks upon the plains smiling at their base. The very height of the hills renders this inundation more imminent and even certain. So, likewise, superiority of station and elevation of rank add immeasurably to the power of men to determine the condition and character of their fellow beings, especially as the traditions of centuries and the instinct of self-interest incline the indignant and ignorant to respect and imitate the affluent and intelligent. Science is attempting to demonstrate the unity of nature, declaring that it is so truly one that all forces are but modifications of one force and all substances but forms of one substance;

and so we come by the line of thought just pursued back to our starting point—the unity of humanity—and to the conclusion that as there can be no adequate science of the physical universe which does not take into account its oneness, so there can be no sufficient scheme of Society, and no successful plans for its amelioration, that are not based on its solidarity.

A Frenchman quotes Schiller as saying, "*L' Histoire est le Tribunal du monde,*" and we are more than willing that the conclusion we have reached should be brought to this tribunal for adjudication. Unless we are greatly mistaken we shall not find written against it "*Adhuc sub judice lis est,*" but rather shall learn that the *plébiscite* of history has been unanimously in its favor. Let us see. Carlyle graphically describes the stately processioning at Versailles early in May, 1789, when some fourteen hundred gentlemen marched before the eyes of as many thousands. Six hundred of these solemn dignitaries were dressed in black and belonged to that '*Tiers état*, the Third Estate, which had taken no part in public affairs since 1614, and had not taken much part then. What they could do to remedy existing evils in France no one knew, but it was evident the State could not be much longer navigated without them. The effort had been made and had failed, just as the exclusive programme which they adopted June 17, when they declared themselves to be the National Assembly, was destined to humiliating defeat. Both the royal decree convening them and their own blunder in attempting to dispense with the coöperation of the other estates of the realm demonstrated that the interests of Society are so closely interwoven, and are so identical, that no class or order of the people can be ignored with impunity. The rise and progress of Constitutional government from the days of Earl Simon de Montford to the present prove the same thing. That aggressive noble the the year after the battle of Lewis, 1264, succeeded in

calling the Great Council which combined all the elements of Parliament to deliberate on national affairs and to impose restrictions on the royal prerogative. The summoning of this Council, and the recognition by Edward, 1297, of the Common's right to vote supplies, mark an important epoch in the annals of England; but what is more to our purpose they reveal a deep conviction, or at least an instinctive impression, that the welfare of each body of citizens is so inseparably bound up with the welfare of the other that legislation ought to concern itself with the nation as a unit, and to do so impartially and adequately must be in the hands of representatives of every rank and condition. In the institutions of Greece and Rome we find traces of the same thought struggling for expression, and in reality it underlies the entire conflict for freedom; but we shall not pause to verify this assertion, as we believe the end we have in view can be more directly attained by an appeal to events of a different order and nearer to our own times.

Permit us to recall "The Statute of Laborers," enacted in the reign of Edward III., by which wages were fixed and vexatious regulations of various kinds imposed. By this law carpenters were to receive threepence per day, freemasons fourpence and their "knaves" one penny half-penny, thatchers threepence, plasterers the same and their knaves one-half the amount. By these statutes it was also decreed that "all alliances and covines of carpenters and masons were to be wholly annulled," thus preventing the formation of trades unions or other organizations for the advantage of working people. In 1363 several acts were passed ordaining that servants shall receive milk, meat and cheese, once a day; that shepherds shall not buy cloth exceeding sixpence a yard, or yeomen, traders and artificers one shilling and sixpence. The length of their shoes were determined for them, and burdens of the most onerous description were mercilessly laid on them. All this legislation, as you doubt-

less perceive, was in the interest of the landed proprietors and great barons, and discriminated unjustly and injuriously against the commons; yet those who sanctioned it were convinced of its wisdom and importance, and imagined that the oppression of the poor and the sacrifice of their happiness would contribute to their own security and prosperity. They were rudely roused from this delusion by the stirring events of 1377–1381. Maddened by these cruel exactions, and by the imposition of unequal taxes to defray the expenses of foreign wars, and incited by Ball, the "mad priest of Kent," as Froissart calls him, and alarmed by the spread of the plague, known as the "Black Death," which only exposed them to additional wrongs at the hands of their tyrants, the people under Wat Tyler appealed to arms, marched a hundred thousand strong on London and there asserted their rights. An old ballad relates:

> And then they march't with one consent
> Through London with a rude intent,
> And to fulfil their lewd desire
> They set the Savoy all on fire.
> And for the hate that they did bear
> Unto the Duke of Lancashire,
> Therefore his house they burned quite
> Through envy, malice and despite.

Green in his history of *The English People* reports Ball as saying in his sermons: "Things will never go well in England so long as goods be not in common, and so long as there be gentlemen and villains." Hume also writes: "It was pretended, that the intentions of the mutineers had been to seize the King's person, to carry him through England at their head; to murder all the nobility, gentry, and lawyers, and even all the bishops and priests, except the mendicant friars; to dispatch afterwards the king himself and, having thus reduced all to a level, to order the kingdom at their pleasure." He admits that in the delir-

ium of success some such projects may have been entertained, and he records some deeds of violence in justification of this suspicion, but he shows that the actual demands of the insurgents were altogether of a reasonable character. These demands were conceded by royal authority, but were ultimately rejected, all decrees and charters executed in their favor being revoked as soon as the mob dispersed. To the superficial reader it may appear that this movement, and the subsequent one under Cade, 1450, were simply disastrous failures, and pernicious in their effects on the popular cause. This opinion, however, is not altogether warranted. It is, of course, true that Tyler, Straw, Cade, and their followers did not succeed as they expected; and yet they accomplished more than history allows—they taught with painful distinctness that primary lesson of Political Economy, the solidarity of Society. They did this unconsciously, and their masters were dull students; yet to all after ages, and to us, they plainly reveal the danger attending the unnatural policy of building up the interests of one portion of community at the expense of the other, and the insecurity of the advantages and their destructive re-action against themselves, which result from this crafty scheme of segregation. Had the king and barons of those times possessed discernment, which unfortunately! they did not, they would have perceived that every enactment which tended to impoverish the people imperiled their own fortunes, and that every attack on the liberty, the industry, independence, and enterprize of the masses must ultimately recoil with terrible force against themselves.

That, however, which the infatuation of selfishness prevented them from seeing, was again forced on the attention of the world by the sanguinary revolt of German peasants in the sixteenth century. The lot of the *Rustauds* was indeed deplorable. They were the prey of priests and nobles,

and were treated by them as aliens and savages. Robbed, scourged, imprisoned, murdered, at the pleasure of their superiors, they were alike strangers to joy and hope. Bankers, like the Fuggers of Augsburg, were enormously wealthy, and some of the great nobles were exceedingly rich, but the nation as such was poor. The more money wrung through cruel exactions from the peasants by ecclesiastical and laical plunderers, the less they seemed able to retain in their own coffers. The entire population was practically beggared by the repacious greed of the few, and only a few of the few were profited by the grasping policy of the times. It is related of the Fuggers that when they entertained Charles V. at their palatial residence, they warmed his apartment by burning sandal-wood which they kindled with royal bonds given for moneys loaned the emperor—a senseless and vulgar display of wealth somewhat similar to those which have occurred in our own day. But this splendid blaze serves to bring into relief the dire darkness and distress of the people, and the sharp contrast really heightens the solemn truth that national decadence follows the monopoly of wealth. This truth, however, was to receive a bloody vindication during the fateful years of 1524–5, and it was again to be tragically illustrated that the law of solidarity will ever find calamitous and terrific means of retaliation against its violaters and despisers. The bankers lit their sandal-wood fire to illuminate their affluence; but the outraged peasants started a conflagration of a different kind to illuminate their indigence. Encouraged by the battle-words of Luther, and exasperated by their sufferings, the peasants rose in rebellion against their lords in Swabia, in the Black Forest, in Franconia, in the valley of the Neckre, in Hesse, Thuringia and Saxony. Some among them painted a sun on a white banner, and took for a motto the words:

> *"Wer frey will seyn,*
> *Der folge diesem Sonnenschein."*

They were mistaken. In one sense popular movements lead to the light, but not when they set out to burn private property and to give the treasures of ages to devouring flames. This was the blunder of the peasants, as it was of the Parisian Communists after the fall of Napoleon. The only sun of these despairing serfs was that which they ignited in their wrath, and which reddened mountain top and quiet vale. Convents, churches, castles, they doomed to the torch of the incendiary, and property worth millions was reduced to ashes. Hot work this with a vengeance; but altogether too terrific and scorifying to suit our hyperborean ideas of prudence or even of right. One wrong does not justify another, and is certainly no remedy for wrong. It only divides the already divided community, and further alienates those who ought to be united. The peasants harassed and slaughtered the nobles and destroyed their possessions, as many of their own number had been slaughtered and as many of their own little homes had been destroyed. Retribution works through them, but not reform or social regeneration. They are ultimately overborne and subdued, and taste once once more the bitterness of oppression. Nevertheless, though their immediate purposes were thwarted, they had revealed to Europe that its safety and prosperity depended on the well-being of the many, not of the few, and that the sacrifice of the millions to the excessive greed of the hundreds, being totally subversive of the divine law of fraternity, must inevitably be attended by revolts, recklessness and bloodshed, in which the fortunes of the favored ones, and probably their lives, will be swallowed up. When, in 1535, Charles V., with a powerful army moved on the mighty slave-holding chief, Barbarossa, at Tunis, it seemed very doubtful whether he could reduce him to submission, and likely the result had been different from what it was but for the white slaves in the town, who, at great risk to themselves, rose in arms and overthrew the tyrant,

These slaves constituted the one weak and vulnerable point in the camp of Barbarossa. He did not appreciate this fact, and he fell. So the peasants of Germany were an element of peril to their oppressors, ready on every suitable occasion to break through restraints and avenge themselves. Thus, likewise, the suffering multitudes of France at a later period were a stifled threat to royalty and its allies, and when an emergency occurred and the throne was practically bankrupt they swiftly took advantage of these embarrassments, deluged the streets of Paris in blood, and brought to the block the men and women who had neglected them and had treated them as "dumb driven cattle." So also now the pauper population and the criminal classes are a constant menace to the money kings, whose reign is stained by cruel exactions and gigantic frauds, and the opportunity is only needed for these discontented and degraded peoples to rise in their fury and execute a horrible retaliation on those who have so pitilessly abused their confidence, necessities and helplessness. Perhaps, then, when dynamite is wrecking the property, and hoarse, drunken crowds are yelling for their blood, and when lurid flames, belching cannon, murderous musketry and devilish orgies announce the triumph of death and destruction, these glittering, greedy, grasping, grinding gentry of ours, will wake from their present pleasing slumbers and discover that human solidarity is something more than a philosophical abstraction, and is indeed nothing less than a tremendous reality charged with sulphurous smoke and scorching lava, and dooms-day lightnings destined to stifle, consume and blast those who have treated it with supercilious scorn and contempt. Better open our eyes to the truth, my friends, before the arrival of an hour so fateful; and better learn from history than wait to be taught by bitter experience. As Carlyle significantly writes: "A Cromwell Rebellion, a French Revolution

striking on the horologe of time to tell all mortals what o'clock it is, are too expensive if we could help it."

The principle we have here discussed is evidently fundamental to any sufficient and satisfactory solution of the problems which perplex Society. Its recognition is as necessary to the formation of anything like a just Social Science as gravitation is to a correct scheme of the physical universe. We cannot, without anticipating what may be said with greater force in subsequent papers, indicate at this point all of its practical bearings, or determine in advance its specific relation to those grave questions which are exciting the attention of thoughtful people in every community. All in good time. But while some of the applications of the law may be left to disclose themselves hereafter, there are others, notably two, which may be considered and ought to be in this connection.

The first of these is the necessity for equal and impartial legislation whenever government feels called on to regulate the commercial or industrial affairs of the people. Let it be distinctly understood, we are not clamoring for such regulation, and firmly believe, as any one can see who reflects on what we have already written, that the less we have of it the better for all parties concerned. Society has never gained much from the State. It may do better in the future, but its past dealings have not been of a character to inspire confidence. Those who rely on it are those who, as Professor Sumner says, regard it "as an entity having conscience, power and will sublimated above human limitations, and as constituting a tutelary genius over us all." But history, as well as contemporaneous events, proves that this is an illusion. The State, as a rule, is very human, has no conscience worth speaking of, and commits as many blunders, and in general is as stupid as the mass of unofficial mankind. This is decidedly the American view. In this country our leading political

economists adopt the great principle of *laissez faire* advanced by Adam Smith, as being more in harmony with the spirit of our Constitution, which rests on the autonomy and sacredness of the individual and not on the Divine authority and sacredness of government, than any absolutist and despotic theory whatever, however it may be disguised by fine phrases regarding liberty, fraternity and equality. According to the American doctrine man is greater than any agent he employs, and governments are simply instruments made by the people for the people, and to serve the people in those things which common consent has delegated to them; and it holds further that the citizen must take care of himself in business and in property relations, that he must depend on his own energy and skill, and not on material aid voted by legislatures; that no grants of money are to be made as benefactions, except, perhaps, in the case of extensive disasters, and that ordinary calamities which overtake labor, commerce, agriculture and manufactures must be met and repaired by the parties directly concerned. Lieber (*Civil Liberty*) confirms this interpretation. He contrasts Gallican liberty with that of America, and shows that the former is essentially "a popular absolutism," a supreme centralism, an arbitrary parent born of his own children, sometimes so harsh as to warrant the paradox of Proudhon—"no one is less democratic than the people"—; while the latter he clearly shows is, in theory at least, the antipodes of everything that enters into the French conception. In France the people feel that the authorities ought to provide for them in emergencies; and consequently they do not hesitate to appeal to them for bread when it is needed, and to depose them summarily when they do not supply it. They make out of their representatives in office a kind of providence, and look to them for such interpositions as shall save them from disaster. With us it is different, the

genius of our institutions is such that it promotes personal independence, inspires every man under God to be his own special providence, and leads the citizens in general to conclude that the State needs them far more than they need the State. But while this is undoubtedly the real American doctrine, we are not to suppose that it has never been departed from in practical politics, or that it may not be necessary at times to temper and restrain individualism by a wise and moderate paternalism. In the judgment of many, our representatives have on various occasions pursued the fatherly policy, as for instance in devising and maintaining a protective tariff, and in interfering in Wall street to avert from stock-gamblers the result of their speculative mania. The propriety of these special interpositions we shall not discuss, though we must say that they evince too much of the spirit of favoritism to command our hearty approval. There are others, however, such as the common school system, to which this objection does not apply. But apart from the wisdom or unwisdom of these particular cases, they illustrate the fact, that only comparative fidelity to the *laissez faire* rule has been feasible in American legislation. Perhaps this is all that should be looked for, and possibly it is all that should be desired. Our own view is, that individualism is fundamental to the idea of liberty, and that paternalism in government should always be subordinated to its conservation, and should be invoked mainly to correct its abuses and obstruct its selfishness. We believe that paternalism should be kept at the minimum, not prohibited altogether. If it can be resorted to occasionally with benefit to all, and without impairing the sense of independence and manhood in any, it may be allowed to pass unchallenged. But, as we have already intimated, it is ever to be regarded with suspicion, and should only be applied as a *denier ressort.* Once adopted as the supreme

law of government private interests and personal freedom would speedily be things of the past. Consequently, too great care cannot be taken in calling into play an instrument of such doubtful expediency. Far better discourage Congress from direct interference in the domain of trade; but if in some circumstances it is imperative, as we admit it may be, let us learn from the reality of human solidarity that it must be impartial if it is to be beneficial. Enactments that discriminate in favor of one class, will in the long run prove prejudicial to all. In Europe this simple truth has been frequently ignored, or what is worse, has been scorned and repudiated. Statutes exist there, and are yet in force, which bear heavily and cruelly on certain portions of the population, and until they are annulled discontent and secret treason will foment and threaten.

Nor has America entirely escaped from similar pernicious legislation. Particularly, though not exclusively, does it appear in relation to her railroad interests, and a glance at it in that connection will show how indulgent a mother she is at times to some of her children, and how hard her favoritism bears on others of them. It is not generally understood how vast have been the donations of public lands to companies. The figures are simply bewildering. The amount actually granted by Congress appears to be about 215,000,000 acres. "This does not include the railroad land grants from the State of Texas, amounting to 38,457,600 acres, as given by the *Chicago Tribune*, which must be taken into account to make a complete showing, making a grand aggregate, in round numbers, of 255,000,000 acres." Here we have a territory computed to be two-thirds greater than the total area of Great Britain, and more extensive by fifty millions of acres than the thirteen original states of our Union, and just about equal in size to the empire of Austro-Hungary and the kingdom of Italy, with Switzerland and the Netherlands added. Phew! it takes one's breath

away! To think of such vast tracts of land, such principalities and empires being voted away by a handful of men in Washington, such wholesale squandering of the patrimony of unborn generations; why it is enough to excite popular indignation to the boiling-point of insurrection, and to awaken regrets that Congress, as John Randolph would have said, being a corporation, "has no soul to damn and no body to kick." The people have been despoiled. They have been robbed of what represents a cash value of $600,000,000, and that, too, for the special benefit of some five companies, which in their turn are controlled by not more than twenty-five men. That is, all this wealth has been deliberately taken by Congress out of the pockets of the masses and handed over to these few gentlemen to do with as they please. Wars have been waged in Europe for the possession of far less territory than is involved in these railroad grants; and today France would shed the blood of her noblest men in battle if she saw the least chance of regaining Alsace or Loraine from the iron talons of Germany. Yet that entire district or province is a trifle, a mere speck of a garden, in comparison with the bewildering number of acres donated by our law-makers, who in this connection may be regarded as "law-breakers" as well. But though suffering from this great outrage the people have remained passive and peaceful. They are to be commended. It might, however, have been otherwise if the nation had not been engaged in war for its existence when the first grant of land was made to the Union and Central Pacific corporations, July 1, 1862; and it might be otherwise now were not our citizens convinced that reason and justice are more potent than violence in settling such disputes as these. But let it not be supposed that they approve the transactions by which they and their children have been despoiled because they are thus pacific. Far from it. They condemn them, and the more they know of them the more bitter will be their con-

demnation. They remember that Congress more than twenty years ago "perfected a land system by which the public domain was set apart for the benefit of the people." This legislation rendered it possible for every man and woman who desired a farm to procure one. These homestead laws limited the sales of public lands to lots of 160 acres each, and the price to be paid was merely nominal. Under this scheme small holdings would have multiplied, and though railroads might not have been built very rapidly, they would ultimately have been built, and in the meanwhile the nation would have been saved from a vast amount of distress which has resulted largely from the feverish and hasty attempts to develop the country.

The arraignment is, that Congress had no right to vote away the property of the people, and that in doing so it has not only practically ignored its own homestead laws, but has entailed many evils on this generation. It is argued that these vast grants impair the ability of the government to keep faith with the citizen; that they have encouraged monopolies, which again have tended to foster tenant farming, and have risked the future of the Union by playing into the hands of a few soulless speculators. To these representations doubtless the answer will be made, that the people have an equivalent—the railroads—and that they are opening the way to civilization and prosperity. But against this view of the case it is urged, that the people have received no fair and sufficient compensation. Their lands have paid for the building of the roads, and the corporations have pocketed the profits, profits not merely in the earnings of the roads, but in the enhanced value of the lands, these lands being now sold at prices greatly in advance of government estimate. Indeed so enormous have been the profits, that it is questionable whether any private capital has been really lost in these enterprises. Of course there have been some queer dealings in bonds, watering of stock,

and similiar scheming by which many have been financially ruined; but taking the actual cost and comparing with the immense gratuities and the appreciation in value, no one has been out of purse except the poor legally plundered people. Moreover, it is to be added, that large portions of these grants have been exempt from taxation; and that they have directly encouraged the growth of those huge farms which have damaged the character of agricultural industry in the Western States. The process and the sequence are not hard to describe. Railroad magnates themselves, or by syndicates, dispose of vast tracts of land, which, by the way, government could not sell in such quantities to single owners without special legislation, and we have farms of 65,000 acres, 100,000 and even 500,000 acres. Such monster estates mean ruin to those who hold smaller ones. The proprietors of the mammoth farms can command abundant capital; they obtain special rates for transportation, and procure machinery and implements at less cost than the small farmer pays, and consequently competition with them is impossible. In the struggle for existence the weaker go under, and their land is continually being sacrificed to meet liabilities, and already in the districts referred to, it is being concentrated in a few hands. If to this it is said the roads running across the continent from the lakes have been of incalculable benefit, we reply that there are reasons for believing that their value has been overestimated. They have certainly not diminished poverty; they have not diverted the overflowing population from cities; they have not aided the unemployed to permanent occupations, and they have not contributed in any remarkable degree to the general prosperity. It would be unjust to lay at their door the entire blame for the business depression of the past few years; but unquestionably they have had much to do with its beginning and continuance. Not, however, because they were built, but

because of the means employed to construct them. They owe their existence measurably to corruption, bribery, gambling, and speculation, and they have stimulated these curses everywhere, and as a result we have had inflation and subsequent commercial prostration. The high-pressure speed has ended where it only could end—in collapse. Possibly the government cannot now retrace its steps, and cannot cancel the iniquitous grants which have been made to railroad corporations. There may be no honorable way of annulling these, but at least we may learn from their pernicious effects to avoid such legislation in the future. Wherever companies have not complied with their promises their lands should be regarded as forfeited, as they really are; and our representatives should be given distinctly to understand that we will submit to no additional robberies; nay, more than this, that we will neither countenance nor tolerate any more laws that discriminate against rich or poor, black or white, or that in any way place one portion of the population in the greedy grasp, and within the rapacious power of the other. In other words, we ought not to allow the criminal blunders of the past to be repeated; and gathering from the principle of solidarity that no interest can be safely built up at the expense of another, we ought to insist, if legislation is indispensable for trade or labor, that it be equal, fair and impartial.

A final application of our subject may be made to that excessive "individualism" which is so prevalent in our times. We set forth in the earlier portions of this dissertation the unlovely and selfish character it had assumed of late; and our entire argument has pretty clearly indicated its baleful effects. But let us remember we cannot now abolish "individualism." No act of Congress, no authoritative decree, and no system of political economy can suppress or annul it. Legislation and philosophy can

never prevail against it, nor would it be for the best interests of Society for them to succeed in effacing it from humanity. Its destruction would be a blunder; its legitimate and benevolent exercise would prove a blessing. Now the law of solidarity emphatically declares its responsibility, and reveals the course it must pursue if it is to serve and promote the best interests of community. This law does not diminish the importance of the individual, but rather exalts while it corrects and directs. It does not deny or depreciate the power of the unit on the mass; but admitting its reality, would have the mass molded by the unit for good. Indeed it shows distinctly and sharply that the unit cannot but act on the multitude, and as a consequence the welfare of the multitude depends on the conduct of the unit. If then the separate members of Society would only cease clamoring as much as they do about their rights and would address themselves heartily to their duties, and if they would cultivate a more generous, kindly, paternal, and enlightened public spirit many of the evils which now afflict us would be remedied.

It was complained of the French revolutionists that they desired to be free but knew not how to be just; that is, they stood for their own and cared not for others. Had they reversed this policy, or had they happily blended personal freedom with social justice, they would have been spared many inflictions, not the least of which has been their Napoleons on the one hand and their Rocheforts on the other. "Why don't our great men move and save the people?" was asked by an orator in the *Corps Legislatif* at Paris: "Because," replied a solemn voice, "they are all cast in bronze," referring to the belief that they had ceased to exist, except in effigy. Significant answer, even more significant than the speaker thought. The great men of France, of England, or of America are not all dead. These nations have mighty statesmen, financiers, jurists,

inventors, and strong leaders in every department of thought and activity, but they are cast in bronze; nay, worse than that, a harder and more debasing metal flows in their viens—gold. They are conformed to its genius, and embody the mean passions it symbolizes. Were it otherwise, were they men of flesh and blood, and were they to enter into the spirit of the famous sentiment expressed by Terence: "*Homo sum, et humani a me nil alienum puto,*" Society would speedily be rescued from the foes which now prey upon it. The demand of the hour is that everyone should be made to feel his personal responsibility for the wrongs and sufferings which prevail, and should be compelled to recognize the ability he possesses, whether great or small, for their correction and abolition. Surely it is a much nobler thing, a diviner thing, and one that must in the long run bring incomputable compensation, to work for the well-being of the race than to labor perpetually for the advancement of self. Schiller represents Fiesco, in his immortal play of that name, as debating in his own mind what course to pursue toward the people of Genoa, and his words are worthy our consideration. The young conspirator argues in this language:

"To obey! or to command! To be or not to be!—The space between is as wide as from the lowest depths of hell to the throne of the Almighty. From that awful height to look down securely upon the impetuous whirlpool of mankind, where blind fortune holds capricious sway! To tame the stubborn passions of the people, and curb them with a playful rein, as the skillful horseman guides the fiery steed!—With a breath—one single breath—to quell the rising pride of vassals, whilst the Prince with the motion of his scepter, can embody even his wildest dream of fancy!—Ah! What thoughts are these which transport the astounded mind beyond its boundaries! Prince!—to be one moment prince, comprises the essence of a whole existence. 'Tis not the mere stage of life—but the part we play on it that gives the value!" * * * * * O artifice of sin, that masks each devil with an angel's face! Fatal ambition! Everlasting tempter! Won by thy charms, angels abandoned heaven, and death sprung from thy

embraces. Thy syren voice drew angels from their celestial mansions. Man thou ensnarest with beauty, riches, power. To gain a diadem is great—to reject it is divine! Perish the tyrant! Let Genoa be free—and I will be its happiest citizen."

And happy would Fiesco have been had he yielded to this just indignation, and rejecting ducal honors, had devoted himself to the real advancement of the Commonwealth. Then indeed would he have played a noble part which would have imparted a priceless value to his life. But, alas! he chose the more selfish course, and died as ignobly as he had lived. Let his example be avoided; and let us all learn from the unity of humanity, the grandeur of a career in sympathy with its needs. Even let us cultivate the feeling that our service in its behalf cannot be dispensed with, and that there is none of us so lowly as to be useless in conserving its liberties and in promoting its prosperity. This is an "egoism" Society can approve, and it is full of hope and promise. Be as egoistic as you please in this respect. You are of importance; you can make yourselves a blessing; you can make the world better for your being in it; and you can leave behind you guiding "foot-prints in the sands of time."

This then is the practical and direct bearing of the theme we have considered in this paper. Do you sneeringly reply, "this is only a common-place, a trite moral which no one will gainsay"? And are you disposed to add, "there is nothing very practical in this; what we specially need is some comprehensive law which shall so regulate social relations that injustice and suffering will be next to impossible"? Many people talk in this foolish way, and thus tend to blind themselves and others to their actual responsibility. How far such a law is possible we shall not be slow to point out at the proper time; but in the meanwhile it should be remembered that no law can be effective apart from public opinion and prevailing senti-

ment. We have on the statute books many wholesome provisions which are never put in force, because the conscience of the nation has grown away from them. They are a dead-letter and a by-word. Others may be added, and every wrong be proscribed and every right be defended, and yet Society remain just as it is; and it will so remain unless the majority of citizens are in harmony with their aims and spirit. If this is a fact, and we shall not insult your intelligence by calling it in question, it is important and highly practical to educate the popular mind and heart to an adequate realization of individual influence and power. Without this no new and even meritorious system of Society will be worth the paper it is written on; and with this, systems incomparably poorer than any now extant will be harmless and indifferent. Therefore with all due respect to those who toss their heads superciliously at the triteness of the remedy suggested by a candid view of solidarity, we still insist on its value and practicality. No one can deny that this "commonplace" is largely ignored, and that everything done toward its restoration, everything that tends to render it more sharp and vivid, must be advantageous to the race; and such being the case every effort to guide individualism aright must be more eminently utilitarian than even specific statutes and revised governments. Here, then, we rest our defense of the worth of this second lesson derived from the subject discussed, and in harmony with it we call on all who read to go forth unaided, and if needs be alone, to the conflict with social evils of every description.

It is reported of King Henry that, having sought refuge from a furious storm in a castle, Earl Simon approached him and entreated him not to fear. To which the royal craven was honest enough to answer, "I fear thunder and lightning not a little, Lord Simon, but I fear you more." And it is equally true that vice, corruption and darkness which make

a hell on earth, tremble before an earnest, self-sacrificing man. The crash of elemental forces are nothing when compared with him; and if we can muster an army of such men we shall soon find that all the powers of Night and Despair can not resist its onslaught. Therefore, we summon you, dear reader, to your post; yea, the wails of suffering millions, more pathetic and more potent than anything mortal pen can write, call you to battle and to victory. In the words of Adelaide Proctor—

Rise for the day is passing
And you lie dreaming on;
The others have buckled their armor
And forth to the fight are gone.
A place in the ranks awaits you,
Each man has some part to play—
The Past and the Future are looking
In the face of the stern Today.

II.

THE PROGRESS OF SOCIETY.

"I recognize, contemplate and approve
The general compact of Society.
* * * * * Touch
The work I may and must, but—reverent
In every fall o' the finger-tip, no doubt.
* * I find advance i' the main and notably
The Present an improvement on the Past,
And promise for the Future, which shall prove
Only the Present with its rough made smooth.
* * * * * * *
We have toiled so long to gain what gain I find
I' the Present, let us keep it! We shall toil
So long before we gain, if gain God grant,
A future with one touch of difference
I' the heart of things, and not their outside face,
Let us not risk the whiff of my cigar
For Fourier, Comte and all that ends in smoke."

—*Robert Browning.*

THE dream of Hesoid, re-sung by Ovid, Virgil, Horace and Juvenal, that man enjoyed at first the blessings of a golden age, and has descended through various changes to an iron era, is not sustained by the dispassionate voice of history. Whatever may be true regarding Eden, this much seems evident, that after the fall of Adam the condition of the race was exceedingly low, and primitive Society a very rude, simple and barbarous affair. From this humble beginning there appears to have been a departure upward. The movement of humanity, though varied by reactions and temporary retrogressions, has been, in the main, forward and not backward. It is not our pur-

pose to trace the successive steps of this progress; but it may convince you of its reality to remind you that it has been sufficiently clear and commanding to rouse the attention of various schools of thought, and has led to profound inquiries regarding the principles by which it has been governed. Vico, of Naples, 1725, studied this subject earnestly, and found an answer to the questions he propounded in the doctrines of providence, immortality and self-sovereignty, supplemented by the institutions of religion and marriage. Leibnitz, Lessing, Descartes and Pascal, carefully and thoroughly pursued the same investigation, and with almost identical results. Alike they regarded the race, allied as it is by enduring ties, and compacted and welded by social instincts and social organizations as one man—"as a man who lives always and who learns continually," and who is unceasingly impelled by moral forces within and without toward perfectibility. In our day the problem has been anew discussed by Herbert Spencer, who, following Hobbes, has traced a resemblance between vital and social organisms, and has undertaken to build thereon an elaborate theory. Like a living body, he claims that Society increases in structure as it increases in size. He argues that it proceeds from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the simple to the complex, and that it is under the control of a grim necessity which logically supersedes the action of intelligent volition. All of these theories are exceedingly interesting, though in some respects misleading. While they abundantly prove that the world has neither stagnated nor retrograded they do not always avoid generalizations and conclusions which are hasty, fanciful and confusing. They have, therefore, to be read with the greatest care, and their inferences to be received with the greatest caution. This, in our opinion, is particularly true of some positions maintained by Mr. Herbert Spencer, as Mr. Henry George has very clearly shown.

The writer of *Progress and Poverty* has unsparingly exposed the weak points in the doctrine of our "Philosopher of Evolution," and has laid particular stress on its fatalistic character, "inasmuch as it holds that no change can avail save the slow changes in men's nature:"

> Philosophers may teach that this does not lessen the duty of endeavoring to reform abuses, just as the theologians who taught predestinarianism insisted on the duty of all to struggle for salvation; but, as generally apprehended, the result is fatalism—do what we may, the mills of the gods grind on regardless either of our aid or our hinderance.

It stands to reason could the race be persuaded that progress is the result of uncontrollable causes, operating inevitably, there would be no incentive to antagonize with crushing evils, and no heart to assail and dispute the triumphal processioning of wrong. Such a conviction would mean paralysis and hopeless imbecility; and the fervid advocates of the development hypothesis ought to consider whether its evident disastrous outcome in the domain of practical life does not materially diminish, if not entirely destroy its general credibility and trustworthiness. To me it is as the witch Sycorax, mother of the cruel Caliban, who enclosed Ariel in the pine-rift for many years, breeding monsters of despair, fettering and enslaving energy and enterprise, and entailing on mankind nameless and measurelesss sufferings. Only the wand of Prospero, symbol of a diviner ideal, can ever break the spell and release the imprisoned powers. In reply it may be suggested that the law of solidarity, as set forth already in these papers, seems to countenance the Spencerian theory. I grant it may seem to do so, but it does not in fact. Though Society is like a body in some respects, especially in the closeness of its members to each other, and in their mutual interdependence, it is unlike in others. But even were we to admit their essential identity in nature, it would not follow

that the fatalistic notion of progress would be favored or confirmed. Society grows as bodies do spontaneously, and yet there are conditions of growth, which however they may differ, are not independent of the agency of either. Back of both, and animating both, there is an intelligent principle, and through its inquiries and experiences, the truth is soon realized, that physical advancement is inseperable from activities, exercise, and other means which call for volition and endeavor, and that in the same manner social advancement demands forethought and a wise adaptation of means to the desired end. Fatalism is ruled out by these requirements. As well expect a babe abandoned by its parents, and exposed to the fierce forces of nature to acquire strength and the symmetry and proportions of manhood, as to expect tribes and peoples to rise toward civilization through the working of necessary causes which involve neither human consideration, care nor skill. The Macawbers and Mark Tapleys, optimistic in all circumstances, and ever looking for "something to turn up," very happily illustrate what would be the practical outcome of the Sociology of Evolution were it to succeed in establishing itself as just and true; and from their career we can readily infer into what dilapidation and decay Society would fall were it unfortunately to prevail.

While we have asserted the reality of progress we are not oblivious to the fact that much can be said and has been said on the other side. Our pessimists and cynics do not hesitate to sneer at the enthusiasm of its defenders, and piteously characterize everything put forth on its behalf as mere puffery, vaporing and rhodomontade. The *Pall Mall Gazette* says:

> One of the ablest and most philosophical writers of our day discourses in the *Quarterly* concerning the hollowness of our so-called age of progress. The conclusion at which he arrives is that there is very much of a muchness in man, and that "the heir of all the ages in

the foremost files of time" differs but in a thin veneer from the aboriginal savage. Says this melancholy moralist: Like the savage, the Englishman, Frenchman or American makes war; like the savage he hunts; like the savage he dances; like the savage he indulges in endless deliberation; like the savage he sets an extravagant value on rhetoric; like the savage he is a man of party, with a newspaper for a totem, instead of a mark on his forehead or arm; and like a savage, he is apt to make of his totem his god. He submits to having these tastes and pursuits denounced in books, speeches or sermons; but he probably derives acuter pleasure from them than from anything else he does.

It is to be admitted that these representations are not without some color of truth; and yet they partake too much of the querelous temper of Heraclitus to inspire the fullest confidence. Evidently they exaggerate the actual infirmities and imperfections of civilized humanity in the nineteenth century. We, of course, do not deny that man himself, more than his environments, is the supreme test of the reality of progress; but even thus judged we believe impartial inquirers will concede its genuineness. While some of the savage instincts may occasionally reveal themselves in his character and pursuits, and while fanciful philosophers may be able to institute amusing comparisons, place an average Englishman and an average wild child of the American forest side by side, and the differences that separate will so far outnumber those which unite, that relationship between them will seem impossible; and maintain that the former was in bygone ages substantially like the Indian of the present and you will have proven decisively that progress is no dream. It is unhappily true, that men in the most refined and enlightened countries are weak, frail, grasping, sometimes cruel and frequently unjust; but when compared with men of other times they have every reason for congratulation. The bad rulers of our day are not so notoriously wicked as the Neros and Caligulas of the past; the licentiousness of the moderns is not so abominably indecent as that of the

ancients; and all the tricks, frauds, and wrongs committed by our most heartless and avaricous monopolists sink into insignificance and smell of Heaven before the murderous and rapacious outrages of such monsters as Oppianicus, and other citizens, like himself, who rendered infamous the expiring years of the Roman Republic. Moreover, though the question at issue is more a question of manhood than of achievement, yet achievement itself, revealing as it does a type of manhood, cannot be ignored in coming to a conclusion on this subject. Man expresses himself in his works. He discloses himself in the governments he founds, the charities he organizes, the books he writes, the arts he fosters, the religion he cherishes, the obstacles he overcomes, the appliances he invents, the discoveries he makes, and the enterprises he inaugurates; and thus judged man to-day is immeasurably in advance of his ancestors.

But to this it will be said that there are monstrous discrepancies disfiguring Society, which are hard to reconcile with this view. Of these we are only too painfully conscious to attempt a denial. We agree with what Rev. James Martineau writes regarding certain bitter and appalling contrasts in England, and recognize their existence to some degree in America, and still we adhere to our optimistic faith."

"Our country," he says "is a vast congery of exaggerations. Enormous wealth and saddest poverty, sumptuous idleness and unrewarded toil, princely provision for learning and the most degrading ignorance, a large amount of laborious philanthropy, but a larger of unconquered misery and sin, terrify us with their dreadful contrasts of light and shade. It is appalling to think of the moral cost by which England has become materially great. Where is the laborer by whose hand the soil has been tilled? In a cabin with his children, where the domestic decencies cannot be. I know not which is the most heathenish, the guilty negligence of our lofty men, or the fearful degradation of the law."

A pathetic and not an unfaithful picture this. But it should never be forgotten that time has been when there was hardly anything except poverty in the world, when there was practically no philanthropy at all, when ignorance was the rule even among princes, when toil was performed by slaves or serfs, who had no prospect of ever being anything better, when indecencies were common in palaces as in huts and were openly paraded on the printed page, and when there was no morality worthy the name to give in exchange for material prosperity. Bad as our age is, it is not the worst; selfish and vicious as our generation may be, it is not as utterly conscienceless and heartless as some of the generations which have preceded it; and in advantages, opportunities, and privileges the blindest must see that it is far ahead of all others.

The deplorable circumstances and unfortunate tendencies which warrant complaint, only indicate that progress has not reached the zenith; they do not justify the discouraging opinion that it is an illusion and sham. Our readiness to detect incongruities and apparent contradictions, combined with our promptness to denounce evils old or new, is itself a sign of elevation and prophetic of a further onward movement. Discernment of wrong and woe implies at least that sufficient light has come to bring them into relief. It means that men have climbed high when they can see clearly the shadows and darkness that settle on the vales beneath. The sun has risen, only its path is thick with storm-breeding clouds; the chariot rolls forward, only its wheels are splashed with mud and slime; the army advances to victory, only it leaves many dead and wounded on the field. It is vain for Froude to argue as he does in his *Short Studies* that the modern world is distinguished more by change than progress; for the changes he notes, such as the alteration in the pursuits and manners of the gentry and clergy, the modification of the old ap-

prentice system with its barbarities, the enlightenment and enfranchisement of the people, with all the fresh discoveries of science and their application in unnumbered inventions to the needs of the race, are themselves signs of genuine progress, though we may not yet have fully acquired the act of adapting ourselves to the new condition of things or of averting the temporary evils which it entails. He is undoubtedly correct when he writes, "The upward climb has ever been a steep and thorny one, involving, first of all, the forgetfulness of self, the worship of which in the creed of the economist, is the mainspring of advance;" but he is wrong when he insinuates that there has been no "climb" whatever. We are certainly not enamored with Society as it is; we have conceded its awful extremes of misery and happiness; only we are not blind to its superiority over the past, and its promise of nobler achievements in the future. Of this hope Froude himself is not altogether destitute, for he says, "That the change will come, if not to us in England, yet to our posterity somewhere upon the planet, experience forbids us to doubt"; but "experience" warrants no such thing if during thousands of years of history we have only witnessed changes and nothing more. Our criticism is not that he exaggerates existing evil, but that he is so willfully oblivious to the good as to undermine all reasonable expectation of any great and wholesome improvement. As Tennyson sings, it is what men have done that is the earnest of what they can and shall do; and we grant were it not for this assurance we should find no promise anywhere of a time to come when capital shall no longer be endangered by its own greed, or labor be imperilled by its own passions, or law be dishonored by its injustice, or taxation be disgraced by its inequalities. But seeing this, believing this, we can with confidence echo the inspiring strain of the poet:

Men, my brothers, men the workers ever reaping something new;
That which they have done, but earnest of the things that they shall do.
For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world and all the wonder that would be.
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight dropping down with costly bales;
Lo! the war-drums throb no longer, and the battle-flags are furled,
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

Mr. Froude, when illogically conceding the probability of a tomorrow more radiant than all the yesterdays of history, declares that "the manner of it is hopelessly obscure." This is not unlikely; for man being a free entity, having unexplorable resources, it is very difficult to anticipate what means or methods he may employ in years to come for the actualization of tradition's golden dream. The star-maps of the past do not enable us to cast a reliable horoscope, and by no ingenious astrological scheme can we foretell what shall be in the unborn ages. But our short-sightedness is no sufficient reason for apathy or recklessness. We should never forget that, while the future of the race may turn on unforeseen developments, it is our duty still to work, and to work patiently and thoughtfully, in the direction of progress; and I am persuaded however exceptional events may contribute toward this consummation, that it will materially be promoted by the same agencies, forces and conditions which have served it throughout the centuries. What these are we ought to ascertain; and in addition we ought to familiarize ourselves with the peculiar phases, varying circumstances, and underlying principles which have distinguished the onward march of humanity from the beginning. Such inquiries as these will enable us to estimate more justly the character of our own period; will assist us to a satisfactory explanation of its more threatening aspects; will go far toward counteracting apprehension and discouragement, and will not only stimulate, but will also serve to direct endeavor.

In pursuing this retrospect we can hardly fail to perceive at the outset that progress is impossible apart from adequate incentives; and these according to Mr. George may be summed up in "the desire to gratify the wants of the animal nature, the wants of the intellectual nature, and the wants of the sympathetic nature; the desire to be, to know, and to do—desires that short of infinity can never be satisfied, as they grow by what they feed on." Unquestionably necessity, necessity made painfully real by losses, privations and sufferings, has ever stirred up the race and impelled it onward. This is apparent in the history of Israel's deliverance from Egypt. The people cried out because of cruel bondage, and because heartless injustice linked itself with slavery. They grew desperate, were ready to follow any leader and attempt any dangerous venture. In this respect they illustrate the primal cause of social elevation—the tyranny of cold and hunger; the pitiless savagery of savage nature quickened the inventive faculties of man to shield himself from their assaults, and to render himself in some good degree independent of their power. And since then movements inaugurated to suppress vassalage, to exterminate feudalism, to achieve political and religious liberty, to exalt industry, and to effect reforms in government have rarely proceeded from the great, the prospered, the refined, the noble, but from those who felt most keenly the wrongs and outrages which were being perpetrated. Froissart, having referred to the fact that the nobles of England kept the commons in "servage," writes: "These unhappy people began to stir because they said they were kept in servage, and in the beginning of the world, they said, there were no bondsmen. They were men formed in the similitude of their lords; why should they be so kept under as beasts?" And if it had not been for their murmurings—now waxing into a roar of indignation, now summoning the preaching John

Balls and the fighting Watt Tylers and Cades, with tattered thousands at their heels, and then invoking the Jacobins of last century and the Chartists of this—industry in England would still be in chains, and the Constitution of that country would be very different from what it is. The rights which the people enjoy in that favored land, their exemption from arbitrary taxation, and the privileges of representation in parliament, they do not owe to the kindly acts of their kings and peers, but to their own sturdy protests and vigorous blows. The liberty of conscience, which nearly all nations now enjoy, was not conferred by popes or bishops. Ecclesiastical dignitaries never understood its grandeur and never raised so much as a little finger to achieve it for the world. No; it was left to despised Quakers, Anabaptists, and Unitarians to contend for it and win it. In other words, social progress, whether springing from political emancipation, religious freedom, or the exaltation of industry, finds its source in the weary, toiling masses. And as it has been, so very likely it will continue to be. It is not your capitalists, your monopolists, your aristocrats, who have no desires ungratified, and who have no particular burdens to complain of, who will, of their own accord and uninfluenced by popular clamor, take the lead in correcting abuses or in radically changing for the better the condition of the poor. If help comes to the laboring classes, it must come mainly from themselves. They must fight their own battles, and win their own victories. How they are to do so we do not here discuss—it will receive attention by and by—but we may say, as indeed we have already, to prevent misapprehension, that violence and lawlessness will not succeed; for the rude days are past when the guillotine could hope to regenerate a nation. Now we are to learn from the relation of suffering to progress that the wrongs, wretchedness, misery, and oppressions of our times, which we are all bound to

condemn, and which often afflict us with despondency, will ultimately rouse those who endure them to such combined action as shall bring deliverance and with it new advantages to Society; and we are also to learn, when the thunders roar prophetic of this onward movement of the people, neither to quake with fear nor tremble with dismay; for when they are heard the night will be fast hastening into day.

Herbert Spencer says truly: "An ideal, far in advance of practicability though it may be, is always needful for right guidance. If, amid all those compromises which the circumstances of the times necessitate, or are thought to necessitate, there exists no true conception of better and worse in social organization—if nothing beyond the exigencies of the moment are attended to, and the proximately best is habitually identified with the ultimately best—there cannot be any true progress. However distant may be the goal, and however often intervening obstacles may necessitate deviation in our course toward it, it is obviously requisite to know whereabouts it lies." Fair ideals constitute the most potent of incentives. Driven at first by hard necessity humanity comes to need the undimmed visions of seers and prophets to inspire it with aims of the most exalted character, and without such aims its labors must end in a refined species of animalism. The danger still is that individuals and communities will content themselves with the comparatively good, and will fail ardently to seek the superlatively good. Lord Jeffrey, many years ago, insisted that the limits of progress had been reached, and thousands still are incredulous of any radical improvement in the condition of the race, unless it may be in the direction of better dwellings for the lowly, and possibly in the addition of sugar for their coffee and butter with their bread. Such sentiments as these are to be deplored. Convince the masses of the people that they are true; that tyrants are never to be

overthrown; that magistrates are never to befriend the poor; that hungry mouths are never to be filled with bread; that partisanship, jealousy and cruelty, are never to cease, and that crime, lust and war are never to end, and the signal will be given for savage recklessness or for sullen discontent and apathy; but bring them to realize that we are hastening to the day when justice, liberty, fraternity and peace, shall triumph; when virtue shall reign and the fair gifts of God shall be within the reach of every man, and life everywhere be garlanded with joy and beauty, then shall all hearts thrill with hope, and all hands be strengthened patiently to work out a destiny so glorious. This lesson has repeatedly been taught, especially is it conspicuous in the history of Feudalism. When we turn to the dark ages we find institutions very different from those which exist in our times. Barons ruled and serfs tilled their lands and followed their banners. There were distinct classes, and these were petrified so that there was no interblending and no ascent from the lower to the higher, unless in a few extraordinary instances, particularly in the domains of religion and art. Feudalism, in a word, was rigid, hard, narrow; was like the old parched skins described by Christ, without elasticity, into which the new fermenting wine of progress could not be poured without rending and destroying the system altogether. It contemplated no such thing as changes; it had no place for the inquiring, enterprising spirit of innovation, and when this spirit ventured to appear it was thoroughly outraged and indignant. What was the result? Why, it prevented for a long period any radical departures from the established order, and not until ideals born of the Renaissance and the Reformation quickened the minds and energies of the people was an onward movement possible; but when it commenced it was irresistible, and, like pent-up waters seeking their natural channels, swept over and overwhelmed all barriers. So let us learn from this upheaval, if we would

contribute to the growth of human happiness and prosperity, not only to abandon the scurrilous and disparaging temper of the deformed Thersites, but to discover and display before the longing eyes of the world the purest and noblest incentives, and carefully avoid the adoption of social theories and customs utterly at variance with their possible realization.

It is a curious fact, and one that ought not to be overlooked in such a study as this, that progress is frequently liable to interruptions. Pauses occur along the line of its march, periods of arrest, and even of retrogression. But these breaks and chasms, these relapses and deteriorations, while bewildering and discouraging, are not to be regarded as altogether unnatural or useless. They are to be deplored; but they seem to be unavoidable and not entirely without promise of help and blessing. Mr. Sumner states on good authority that the muddy Arve, a river in Switzerland, when swollen by floods, drives the clearer Rhone, with whose waters it mingles, back into the lake of Geneva. At such a time the confluent streams retreat with so much violence from their natural channel that mill wheels revolve reversely, and floating drift is borne toward the source from whence it came. But this singular countermotion, regression, or regurgitation is not without advantages. The Rhone, defiled by the Arve, is recleansed by its bath in the lake, and is reinforced by the rush of downward-flowing currents, so that on returning to its course it sweeps forward with greater velocity than ever, and with increased translucency. As a consequence these qualities are imparted to all the waters with which it blends in its journey to the sea; and thus its temporary refluent action becomes a permanent and wide spread benefit when it is profluent again. In a similar manner we likewise find that the pauses, alternations, and intermissions, which diversify the course of social advancement, in the long run operate in its favor. This the Scriptures

strikingly illustrate. The Jews did not follow a straight path from Egypt to Canaan. They were compelled to pursue a zigzag course, to retrace their steps, and by a circuitous route attain the end of their journeyings. After they possessed their own lands they did not attain to the blessings of Solomon's kingdom without discouraging backsets, losses, and deteriorations. The nation went forward; but in doing so at times it went backward, revealing the fact that progress is accomplished very much as we scale the Alps—we have to go up and down many smaller hills, all leading to a higher level and at last to the summit; and thus have we to climb in pursuit of social perfection. The law of progress in this respect is not unlike that of the century-plant. We find that flower blooming once every hundred years. A process of retrogression then sets in, the stream of life runs low, and then recovering itself slowly ascends until it bursts forth in new though transient beauty. We have corresponding seasons in history. The times of Pericles in Greece, for instance, when civilization seemed at its fairest; and yet it declined, not to revive until the Augustan era of Rome. Roman greatness succumbed to the iron blows of the Goths, and progress seemed at an end. But it was not so. The tide flowed again, and has risen just as the waters creep upward along the shore, by advances and retreats, by push and recoil, by incoming and outgoing. Hence we have the brilliant age of Elizabeth followed by darkness, darkness dispelled by the Puritans, restored anew by the Stuarts, dispersed once more by the Whigs, and fluctuating since the days of William of Orange until the present. Other countries reveal a similar series of reactionary movements, all leading to increasing and more permanent light. We do not doubt but that we have all that is of real value in the civilizations of Egypt, Greece, or Rome preserved to us; that only the transient and the useless have perished; that they

have perished to prevent the world being unduly encumbered and burdened, and to teach that this process is a sifting and refining one. By this means an immense amount of rubbish is gotten rid of. Moreover, just as the lion draws back to gather strength for its onward spring, and just as the winds appear to be gathered by unseen hands into the cavern of the clouds before they leap forth to ravage and destroy, so providence seems to permit seasons of retrogressions in which shall be so keenly realized the world's needs that the energies of Society shall be collected and concentrated for a new endeavor to rend evil and beat down wrong. Signs are not wanting of deterioration among us, even in this land as well as in others—deterioration threatening for the moment to arrest elevation. Strangest fluctuations mark and disturb the continuity of modern improvement; and as the shadows on the dial of Ahaz went backward ten degrees, so now at times the hands of the horologe of this brilliant era appear as though they might possibly turn once more toward night and savageness. With governments professedly humane, with enlarged benevolence—perhaps too large for the interests of justice—and with multiplied publications and diversified religions, possibly too many of both for the real welfare of community—there are yet reactionary movements observable on every side. Wars startle us in one direction, financial panics in another, and iconoclastic politics and infidelities in yet another.

On the authority of Morel, Mitchell, Engel, and Galton we are led to fear that "social agencies are unsuspectedly working toward the degeneration of humanity," and as Galton expresses it: "Our race is overweighted and likely to be drudged into degeneracy by demands that exceed its powers. With the deterioration of the condition of the masses, their organizations and functions, there will be plenty of idiots, but very few great men." We all know,

though we may not stop long enough to ponder its significance, that terrible scourges accompany our much-praised civilization. Labor in factories, where mineral, vegetable, and animal dust, with pernicious gases, are inhaled, or where poisons such as copper, lead, arsenic, tobacco, and phosphorus have to be handled, is productive of weakness, decrepitude, sores, and premature death. Dark and stifling mines, damp and chill basements, reeking and filthy tenements, excessive heat from furnaces, and excessive cold from ice-chambers, combined with the inconveniences which generally attend the lowly in crowded cities, must undermine the constitution, and engender diseases. Such are the effects of pursuits which have largely to do with the preëminence of the century. We seem to be living where two streams meet, one of progress, the other of retrogression, and the current and counter-current lead naturally enough to varying estimates of the age. Some see only the good, and others only the evil. But we should recognize both, and we should try to realize that even the evil, terrible as it is, is not without promise of compensation. There will be a reaction. The swing of the pendulum to one side will bring it back to the other. The gravity of the peril to humanity, if no speedy remedy is found, the depth of the abyss toward which it is gravitating, will arouse slumbering energies, which when fully enlisted, will make a clean sweep of deteriorating agencies and conditions, and the rebound will carry social happiness and prosperity forward to a higher point than they have yet attained.

Proceeding with our inquiry, we now come to the consideration of some of the more important means and forces which have contributed to progress in the past, and which will undoubtedly influence it in the future. Recognizing, as we have done, that it originated in adequate incentives, incentives that are still indispensable, and having attempted

to explain the significance of its vicissitudes, we are prepared to examine and estimate the various streams by which its waters have been fed. Eminent, if not preëminent, among these ranks man's consciousness of personal independence. We mean by the term "independence," first of all, the superiority of individuals and communities to the circumstances which surround them, and the clear conviction on their part that they were never designed to be the helpless slaves of their environments, or of a hard, soulless Fate. The enlargement from undue governmental interference, as we shall see, tends to quicken their energies and develop their resources; but in an equal degree the abiding realization of their substantial freedom from the iron rule of enthroned Necessity, bringing with it the sense of duty and responsibility, stimulates ambition and multiplies activities. In our opinion, the prevalence of the opposite doctrine among Oriental nations largely accounts for their stagnation and immobility. There are times, unquestionably, when Fatalism may exert a salutary influence; but these seasons are comparatively rare. When tribes are struggling for supremacy, when a new faith enters on its career, or when an old dynasty is to be overthrown, and before opportunity has been afforded for thorough scrutiny into all the bearings of this paralyzing dogma, it may rouse enthusiasm and inspire heroic endeavor to believe that the unchangeable purposes of the Changeless Deities are on the side of the aspiring innovators. But when the rage and fury of these enterprises have passed away, and the successful fighters and reformers have settled down to the cold, stern, commonplaces of life, apathy steals over them, and supine indifference takes the place of energetic ardor. Such has been the working of the doctrine in India and China; and such would have been its effect in Europe had not Calvinism been tempered and modified by philosophy; and such must ever be its ultimate outcome where-

ever it prevails absolutely and without admixture. Nor is this inference forced and unreasonable. Were it possible to convince men that their thinking is mechanical and their acting mechanical, and that both are preordained, the life of social progress would be killed. Enterprise would be arrested by the discouraging thought that it is impossible to reverse, revoke, or modify the rigid laws which are driving us onward to our unavoidable destiny. Why attempt anything, when we might just as well forego all labor and drift as helpless as the autumn leaves toward eternity? We are satisfied from what we know of man that the indestructible sense of personal liberty underlies most of his great achievements, that it has stimulated him to measure strength with the fiercest elements of nature, and has fired him with an enthusiasm for the highest possible development of the race. Hence the importance, if we would see progress progressing, of maintaining in the hearts of the people generally a clear conviction of their freedom, and of refraining from everything that would tend to its obscuration. But, it will be asked by those who think that they are damaging Christianity, and who do not realize that their sentiments imperil civilization, is it not true, as Mr. Buckle has taught, "that human beings act necessarily from the impulse of outward circumstances upon their mental and bodily condition?" "Food, soil, climate—do not these make up the man, and determine what he must be?" So it is affirmed by some who are called philosophical radicals. Indeed the burden of modern infidelity is that "man is a plant who grows and thinks, his growth and thought being no more dependent on his volition than the action of a steam engine is on some self-determining power within. Such a theory we hold to be untenable, and the judgment of our best thinkers condemns it. We admit that circumstances have no inconsiderable degree of power over man; but we hold that he is not enslaved by them,

and can conquer them. Climate and soil are important factors, but they do not account for the differences between tribes and peoples. It is said the Spaniards are superstitious because their country is volcanic, but no good reason is given why the Japanese, who inhabit also a volcanic territory, hardly believe in anything supernatural. Why should the citizens of Belgium be more prosperous than the citizens of Ireland? and why is it that districts in Asia, as fertile as the best fields of Europe, are not as highly civilized? It is claimed that the explanation is to be found in the diverse character of the races; but if that is the case, what caused the races to differ? This scandalous hypothesis breaks down as soon as it is scrutinized. Were it true, we ought to be able to construct a science of humanity, just as we have a science of astronomy. If man belongs to the complex mechanism of nature, why not calculate all his movements in advance, foreshow his moods as we do the weather, and predict his misfortunes as we do an eclipse of the sun? But this can not be done; and the fact that it can not, even in the case of an individual, and by a mother who has studied him from the dawn of life, is proof that he is an unknown power, a free personality, and that he belongs to a higher order than that which embraces trees, horses, and oxen. We do not lay stress on the argument derived from consciousness in favor of freedom; but we do insist that the involuntary testimony of life is on its side; for, in all relations, and in all situations, save where this subject is under discussion, we ponder, we weigh motives, we resolve, and in every way act as though we were indeed free creatures, having our interests and destiny within our own keeping. Professor Francis Bowen, of Harvard College, to whose admirable review of Buckle's *History of Civilization* we admit our indebtedness, characterizes the doctrine on which we animadvert "simply as

ludicrous," and sharply adds: "We should almost suspect the sanity of one who seriously entertained it;" and Mr. Froude, in his *Short Studies of Great Subjects*, has very clearly exposed its weakness and worthlessness. Among other points made against it by the last-named writer, is one that turns on what may be described as the "surprises of history." We quote his thought rather than his words. He shows that events have been taking place which no "law of averages," and no scientific balancing of probabilities could have anticipated. Tacitus could never have been convinced that a German Emperor, successor of the Cæsars, would ever hold the stirrup of a Pope, successor of fishermen apostles; and equally contrary to all reasonable expectation is the rise and vigor of Mormonism in a land whose traditions and convictions run in favor of Monogamy, and the spread of the superstition known as Spiritualism in an age of culture, inquiry, and rationalism. Gibbon claimed that the era of conquerors was at an end, and yet had he lived longer he would have seen Europe overrun by Napoleon; and Buckle himself gravely declared that there would be no more great wars, and yet the world has witnessed since this confident prediction was uttered the gigantic conflict between France and Germany. It is evident from these "surprises" that the movements of man are not calculable, whatever may be the data at hand, and that he is not to be classed with atoms or masses which have no power of volition or liberty of action; and it follows from these truths that, as his real welfare must depend on a correct understanding of his essential nature, their denial must tend to his permanent injury and detriment.

But if the recognition of man's independence in the mysterious domain of Providence is of the highest value to progress, it is scarcely less so in the organization and practical workings of Society. What is formulated by sound

philosophy on this subject, cannot safely be ignored in politics. The State ought not by its legislation or its various institutions to diminish, much less destroy, the consciousness of personal freedom, self-hood and responsibility. Wherever this blunder has been committed social immobility has ensued, and wherever it has been avoided or rectified, this fatal torpor has been happily ended. Of course it is not to be denied that in times of grossest tyranny and oppression individuals have appeared who by explorations, discoveries, and inventions, have imparted an impulse to human thought and activity. As on the birth of the universe light emerged from the bosom of darkness, so from the night of the middle ages there broke forth lustrous rays which have contributed to the splendor of modern civilization. But these gifted leaders and innovators were notably endowed with a proud sense of intellecual independence. They were enfranchised in themselves, and unshackeled their convictions in the presence of iron-handed potentates and iron-hearted prelates. And if some of them, like the aged Galileo, were constrained by scientific jealousy and bigotry, and by ecclesiastical narrowness and cruelty to recant, they did not hesitate to recant their recantation, and to whisper, if they did not shout, the truth of the doctrine for which they suffered. The example of these men, then, does not in the least militate against our position. It rather confirms the view advanced that progress is facilitated by liberty; for if these isolated but adventurous spirits were inspired to undertake great things by their self-emancipation, and if otherwise they never would have attempted what they either thought or wrought, it stands to reason that a community of even inferior members similarly enlarged, and especially if untrammeled by governmental restrictions and dictations, can hardly fail to do much toward its own improvement and elevation. Hence it is that history chronicles the

achievement of nobler deeds, and of more radical and more humanizing changes under Republican sway than under Monarchical institutions, unless, as in England, they are of an exceedingly liberal character. The world is more indebted to Athens, with its constitution originally framed by Solon and rendered more popular by Clisthenes, and with its Pericles, Socrates, Phidias, and Demosthenes, whose philosophy, poetry, art and eloquence have served as models for all succeeding peoples and ages, than to the France of Louis XIV. where kingly power reigned supreme and displayed its refinement of taste and elegance of culture; and the names of Miltiades, Themistocles and Leonidas, with the battle-grounds of Marathon, Thermopylæ, and Salamis are entitled to greater honor than the Turennes, Condes and Vaubans, or the bloody fields of Zusmarshausen, Lens, Blenheim and Malplaquet where they defended the policy of their sovereign. Mr. Buckle in a sentence or two characterizes and condemns the period that M. Voltaire has extolled, and which has been called the "Augustine age." He says that even its literary splendor was the work of the great generation that had just passed away, that discoveries and even practical ingenuity were absent; and finally, that the age was an age of decay, of misery, intolerance and oppression, an age of bondage and ignominy. In contrast with Athens how despicable the France of the *Grand Monarque* appears; and in contrast with the England and Holland of the same period, countries then busy with scientific investigations and with the dissemination of truth, how poor and paltry does it seem. Shakspeare says, "To be a Roman once, was greater than to be a king," but that was when the tribuneship, quaestorship and consulate, and other important offices, were open to the plebians, when they could intermarry with the patricians, and attain to the priestly dignities of Pontificate and Augurate. The

elevation of the people, after long and fierce struggles, recognized by the Ogulnian law, B. C. 300, and promoted by the Hortensian laws, B. C. 286, was the forerunner of many victories over foreign foes, and with the close of the Punic wars opened to the Roman Republic its palmiest days. These days alas! were soon to fall into "the sere and yellow leaf." The civil conflict between Marius and Sylla diminished the privileges of the citizens; the rise of the Empire left them only the merest fragments of political power; and when that power became an empty name the Empire itself went tottering to its doom. "O Liberty, once sacred, now trampled upon!" exclaimed Cicero, as the shadows, prophetic of evil, gathered round the nation; and he might have added, "the ruthless feet that tread down liberty will also crush the hopes and happiness of society." One sign of decay under the Empire, observed by Lecky and made prominent by Spencer, appeared in the donations of corn, oil, and even of money to the people and soldiery. These gifts conferred by those who were in office, or by ambitious men who courted popular favor, diminished the feeling of self-reliance on the part of the recipients, and prepared them to become the willing slaves of rapacious masters, or the tools and allies of aspiring demagogues. Thus step by step the masses lost the sense of personal dignity, and with their degradation and practical bondage national progress was not only arrested, but came to an abrupt and disastrous end.

In our own times there are multiplied proofs that the connection between the reality and consciousness of freedom and of social advancement, which we think history affirms, is both close and abiding. Commerce has prospered and developed under free institutions; and where it has been subject to fewest governmental interferences it has expanded and grown. Religion, in proportion as it has

been separated from the State, has gained in strength, purity and usefulness. Where the secular powers leave it alone, there it displays the greatest spirituality, benevolence and enterprise. Science also has achieved its most notable triumphs where the rights of thought and inquiry are most fully recognized and most jealously guarded. And the Press, likewise, has attained its highest degree of intellectual vigor, and fulfills its mission in the worthiest manner, though not without deserved blame, where official censorship is reduced to the minimum, and where the impertinent surveillance of government hirelings is abolished. Even in the direct management of telegraphs and railroads, as has been shown by Sir Thomas Farrer, the public is better served than by the State; and Mr. Herbert Spencer has taught us to doubt the efficacy of excessive legislation. Any one carefully reading his *Study of Sociology* must come to the conclusion, that is, unless he is determined not to be convinced by facts and arguments, that those nations are making the longest and most rapid strides toward civilization where there is least interference on the part of the authorities with the independent action of the citizen. Moreover, in our opinion, the enthusiastic devotion of humanity to liberty in all ages confirms the position we are defending. From time immemorial man has toiled for it, thought, fought and died for it. He has been stirred to the very depths of his being by the example of heroes, like Arnold Winkelreid of Underwalden; and he has treasured as sacred such sentiments as those attributed to William, Prince of Orange, who is reported as saying, "I am held to be the contriver of conspiracies, but what greater glory can there be than to maintain the liberty of a man's country, and to die rather than be enslaved?" Can it be that untold sacrifices have been offered on this altar, and that substantial blessings were not expected in

return? Was it a name, a glittering delusion, a radiant phantom that the noblest races agonized in blood to grasp? Is it likely that a mere form of government, for its own sake, could have moved them to endure privations and untold sufferings? No; common sense, the common sense of the battling multitudes, answers "No"! They bared their breasts to the spear, and exposed their neck to the block for that which they believed would lighten their burdens, ameliorate their condition, promote their prosperity, and increase their happiness. They saw, or imagined they saw, that emancipation was the first step toward the promised land of peace and plenty, and they were inspired by the fair prospect opening before them and the unborn generations, to array themselves against the fortressed might of their oppressors. These were the visions which thrilled and exalted the leaders of the French Revolution, when they met at their feasts of fraternity and equality, and clasped each others hands and embraced in the streets of Paris, and proclaimed a millennium of light and love, of abundance and amity. To them, as to the men of Morgarten, Simpach, Runnymede, Lutzen, and Bunker Hill, freedom meant social advancement; and, unless we regard them all as fanatical dreamers, we too must hold that the connection between them is reasonable and indissoluble.

But if we hold this sincerely, we shall regard with suspicion, not unmixed with apprehension, the plans and theories of the red Socialists and Communists, which in the name of liberty threaten to swallow up the independence of the individual. It is undoubtedly true that some regulative enactments are needed to prevent injustice and to restrain privilege from abuse; but it is equally true that the interests of Society demand that legislation shall not attempt to do everything for the citizen, reducing him to a nonentity or to the level of a slave. Yet this is the practical and logical *Ultima Thule* of the systems referred to,

and which are clamoring on all sides for recognition and adoption. That we are not miscalculating the real outcome of these schemes a witness as reliable as Pierre Joseph Proudhon sufficiently proves. In his *Memoirs* (*see Mr. B. R. Tucker's translation, p.* 259), we read :

I ought not to conceal the fact that property and communism have been considered always the only possible forms of Society. This deplorable error has been the life of property. The disadvantages of communism are so obvious that its critics have never needed to employ much eloquence to thoroughly disgust men with it. The irreparability of the injustice which it causes, the violence which it does to attractions and repulsions, the yoke of iron which it fastens on the will, the moral torture to which it subjects the conscience, the debilitating effect which it has upon society, and, to sum it all up, the pious and stupid uniformity which it enforces upon the free, active, reasoning, unsubmissive personality of man, have shocked common sense and condemned communism by an irreversible decree.

What is this but slavery? The only apparent difference between it and other forms of slavery is the substitution of one master for another, the State taking the place of the Autocrat, the community taking the place of old-time individual proprietors. Mr. Herbert Spencer, with remorseless logic, has elaborated this view in his masterly *brochure,* entitled *The Man Versus the State.* Having shown that private voluntarily-formed societies involve to some extent a surrender of liberty, and have given rise to complaints about "the tyranny of organization," he writes :

Judge then what must happen when, instead of relatively small combinations, to which men may belong or not as they please, we have a national combination in which each citizen finds himself incorporated, and from which he cannot separate himself without leaving the country. Judge what must under such conditions become the despotism of a graduated and centralized officialism, holding in its hands the resources of the community, and having behind it whatever amount of force it finds requisite to carry out its decrees and maintain what it calls order. Well may Prince Bismarck display leanings towards State-Socialism. * * The final result would be a revival of

despotism. * * And if there needs proof that the periodic exercise of electoral power would fail to prevent this, it suffices to instance the French Government, which, purely popular in origin, and subject at short intervals to popular judgment, nevertheless tramples on the freedom of citizens to an extent which the English delegates to the late Trades Unions Congress say 'is a disgrace to, and an anomaly in, a Republican nation.'

The practical working, then, of such a scheme would, in the long run, fatally curtail the liberty of the citizen, and, if we may believe history, would end in social paralysis. In effect it would prove as rigid and as unyielding as Feudalism, and would be as jealous of innovations. On this ground we resent its advances. It means retrogression, declension, blight and mildew; the evening and night of civilization, not its morning. But in resisting this political delusion we must be careful that we do not unthoughtedly and involuntarily contribute to its triumph by unwise and unbalanced legislation. There may be too many laws for the good of the community, as there may be too few, and the quality even may be more pernicious than the quantity. To erect barriers in the way of greed, to fix limitations to acquisition, to check lawless and selfish egoism, to prevent cruel indifference to the welfare of the laboring classes, to protect the weak and helpless against the strong, to compel the proper discharge of reciprocal duties, to repel the inroads of vice, crime and pauperism, and, in a word, to secure the best interests and happiness of the entire body politic, undoubtedly comes within the province of wholesome government; but, at the same time, the discharge of these functions has boundaries which cannot be passed without approximating to the underlying and enslaving principle of Communism. These boundaries are determined by the sovereignty of freedom. Legislation that necessarily tends to diminish the just sense of personal independence, that trammels the exercise of legitimate activities, that lessens the reality of individual responsi-

bility, and that hinders the free play of all human faculties or the full development of all human resources, is but another scheme of the Communistic type, a subtle and cunning device inducing bondage and arresting progress. Such legislation the friends of social advancement are bound to discourage, and must seek by less questionable methods the fruition and consummation of their hopes.

Among other wholesome means which have wrought advantageously in the past, and which are important still, the earnest student will discern as prominent the growth of popular intelligence. In one sense this is a part of progress itself; but in another, it is a cause. Every step onward, whether in the domain of physics or of morals, has been preceded by a degree of intelligence, and has been succeeded by a higher degree, which has contributed in its turn to a yet higher stage, and has itself become inwrought with the general results attained. Thus it is both a cause and a sequence, a beginning and an ending. The animal kingdom is practically stationary. Beavers and bees build now as in former times; and the savage eagle constructs his rude inaccessible eyrie as uncouthly as of old, taking no lessons in delicate architecture or in personal comfort from the curious and luxurious nests of more refined and dainty birds. They are all creatures of instinct, and, consequently, they can only repeat themselves; they do not acquire, and hence they never improve themselves or their surroundings. It is different with man. He is ever learning, ever applying knowledge, and and so is ever re-forming, altering, inventing, changing, and moving onward. Dr. John Trusler (*Synonymes* 1735—1820) draws a distinction which is of value in this connection. He says: "*Intellect*, or understanding power, is a gift of nature; and *intelligence*, or understanding habit, an accumulation of time. So discriminated, *intellect* is inspired, *intelligence* is acquired." Crabb, also on this sub-

ject, writes: "*Intellect* and *intelligence* are derived from the same word; but *intellect* describes the power itself, and *intelligence* the exercise of that power. Hence it arises that the word *intelligence* has been employed in the sense of knowledge or information, because these are the express fruits of intelligence." Intellect, then, is capacity, hence capacity for progress; and intelligence, the mind acting and adding to its riches, is the instrument by which progress is brought about. Now, it stands to reason, the more general the ability to employ this instrument, other things being equal, the greater the likelihood of social advancement. When the people are intent on acquiring knowledge, when they study themselves and their environments, when they are measurably enlightened and curious, and especially when they are free to think for themselves, they are sure to be restless, fertile in suggestions, and ready for radical changes. Indeed, a careful induction of facts, we think, will show that they themselves have produced more such changes than the learned few whose exalted position of privilege would seem to warrant the highest expectations. Understand, we do not mean to assert that some great scholars have not also been great discoverers or inventors; but we maintain that the largest number of useful and beneficent contrivances and appliances are traceable to the practical sagacity and commonsense of those who did not rank high in the Republic of Letters. According to Bacon, the origin of gunpowder, the mariner's compass and the printing press, which revolutionized warfare, navigation and literature, "is obscure and inglorious." The first of these inventions is sometimes ascribed to Friar Bacon, or to the monk Berthold Schwarz, but without sufficient evidence. What Archimedes was far from guessing, and consequently could not employ against Marcellus, that sulphur, saltpetre and charcoal, triturated and mixed together, would blow an

advancing enemy off the earth, was reserved for some observing, earnest, nameless genius to find out. To the ingenuity and skill of mechanics the world is certainly indebted for the printing press. And as to the compass, no Eratosthenes determining the obliquity of the ecliptic, and virtually deciding the circumference of the globe, and no Hipparchus studying equinoxes and calculating lunar and solar tables, ever imagined such a guiding and guarding instrument; but the idea seems rather to have been stumbled on by some hard-headed, far-seeing Chinese soldier or Emperor—Ho-ang-ti, we believe—who lived about 2634 B. C., and through the Arabs to have worked its way into Europe, where, of course, it has been wonderfully improved on. But so little is known of the beginning of its history that it is unsafe to advance any theory on the subject, beyond the purely negative one that it was not the product of genuine and varied scholarship. The same thing may be said regarding some of the most important remedies in the Pharmacopœia; and an English writer of acknowledged repute declares that most of the chemical discoveries which have benefited the arts are due to the manipulations of skilful operatives, rather than to what is called chemical or scientific philosophy. The spinning-jenny was thought out and constructed by a shrewd artisan, assisted by a plain laboring man and an energetic barber's apprentice. Such names as those of the miner Savery, the glazier Cawley, the instrument-maker Watts, and the colliery fireman and plugman George Stephenson, are renowned for their connection with the application of steam to locomotion; and these men, as may be inferred from their callings, were as far from being scholars as were the unfortunate Fitch and the persistent Fulton who led in the application of the same motor to navigation; or the wretched, though evidently intelligent, fellow who anticipated Sir Humphrey Davy in the fashioning of a safety lamp.

John Henry Newman, not only reminds his readers that the world's greatest benefactors are unknown, but thoughtfully adds:

> It is notorious that those who first suggest the most happy inventions, and open a way to the secret stores of nature; those who weary themselves in the search after truth; strike out momentous principles of action; painfully force upon their contemporaries the adoption of beneficial measures; or, again, are the original cause of the chief events in national history, are commonly supplanted, as regards celebrity and reward, by inferior men.

But when they are known, as a rule they will not be found preparing for their special work in scientific academies, laboratories, and secluded libraries. No; they will generally be discovered where Arkwright, Howe, McCormick, Edison and Goodyear were trained, at the blacksmith's forge, or in carpenter shops, cotton mills and in all kinds of manufacturing establishments. These have been their principal schools, as the quarry was the university where Hugh Miller studied. Nevertheless, as we have stated before, these men were not ignorant, stupid and unreflecting. Far from it. In some way they acquired the rudiments of education, were attentive readers, and went through the world with their eyes open. They were essentially intelligent men, and illustrate in their lives the value of popular intelligence to Society. But we shall miss the real significance and force of their example if, for a moment, we regard it as reflecting on the work of ripe scholarship, or imagine that it discredits higher institutions of learning. They rather supplement each other; they do not necessarily antagonize. We should never forget that these higher schools exert a mind-quickening influence on multitudes who never enter their halls, that they create a certain atmosphere of intelligence, and that they slowly accumulate facts, which gradually drift downward to the people, and by them are rendered applicable to the varying

needs of diverse cummunities. The white peaks of Switzerland are not without blessing to the fertile plains and fields of Europe. Those solitary heights gather to themselves the snows of heaven, and seem to wrap themselves in frigid and pallid selfishness. Yet, but for them the rivers would run dry, and smiling valleys would turn to barren deserts. So scholars and scholastic retreats, apparently far removed from popular sympathies, and to the popular apprehension cold and glacial in their splendor, are continually collecting the materials which supply practical sagacity with hint and inspiration. Level the hills and the vales would be beggared; blot out college and university and intelligence would decline, and would ultimately be lost in ignorance. We cannot dispense with them, nor dare we encourage disparaging estimates of their value. Such has not been our design in what we have written. Our purpose has simply been to promote the latter, but not at the expense of the former. We have seen how it has contributed to social development, and the lesson from the argument is unobscure and unmistakable. It may be formulated in a word of advise to the struggling masses—get intelligence. Read, accumulate information, discipline the mind, look into things, observe, reflect. M. Bailly of Switzerland in a report on the competition of American skilled labor with that of his own country, attributes the higher character of the former "to the personal superiority of the American workman." He notices how much is made of a man in this land of ours. One man, he says, runs a railway train in the United States that would require six in Europe; and he adds that our people put more thought into their work than is common in the old world, and consequently that it is generally unequaled in quality. If our artisans would still keep the lead, let them, then, pay heed to this witness from across the sea, and get intelligence. Intelligence will not only enable them to preserve the high character

and reputation of their skill, and qualify them to improve on the improvement of ages and to supplement inventions with new ones, but it will also fit them for the conflicts of the hour which they cannot without loss and discredit avoid. Brain is more important than brawn in deciding the issues which now divide class from class; and if ever existing wrongs shall be righted, and prevailing evils be abated, mind, not muscle, must be our chief reliance. Employers will find it very difficult to defraud thoughtful and well-informed *employés;* capital will be unable to deceive them with its illusive theories of political economy; politicians will no longer succeed in cheating them in the interests of their own ambition; and they themselves will form sounder, juster, more conservative and more discriminating views than are at present common among them regarding the causes and the cure of reigning inequalities and wretchedness.

Perhaps progress is indebted as much to the elevation of industry as to the growth of intelligence; but whether this is so or not, unquestionably the recognition of its real dignity and worth has exerted an immense influence on the fortunes of mankind. The labor that upturns rocks, digs foundations, disinters metals, shapes weapons for war and tools for peace, reclaims deserts, constructs buildings, lays interminable roads of iron, spins incalculable lengths of wire, and that cultivates, fabricates, shapes, molds, weaves, carves, chisels, delves, ploughs, sows, reaps, and, in a word, carries forward the material work of civilization, is held today in greater esteem and honor than ever in the past. We do not claim that it is even now appreciated as it should be, that its value is adequately estimated or its achievements sufficiently rewarded. It suffers still from the prejudices of the so-called upper classes, and from the rapacious greed of those who see in it only a means to personal affluence. Nay it frequently degrades itself by wild

theories of heated and extravagant demagogues, which it adopts as a new gospel fuller of hope than the promises of the old. Silly people still blush to be reminded of ancestors who toiled for a living; and count it as more discreditable to have "butcher, baker, or candle-stick maker," or some milliner, or dress-maker figuring in their pedigree than some ruffian robber-baron, or some frail mistress of royalty. "Gone into trade," was the awful crime recorded of one of Thackeray's characters; and not in fiction only, but in real life, persons whose fortunes have changed and who, in consequence, have been obliged to engage in manual toil, have found the drawing rooms of their former associates closed against them. But these senseless and sickening prejudices, relics of a period when governing, fighting, and praying were about the only respectable things in the world, and the wrongs which are still inflicted through injustice or ignorance, or both combined, do not compare with the stupid, supercilious scorn and the barbarous, fiendish outrages that were visited on industry and cursed it in former ages. We have already seen how legislation in the reign of Edward III. pressed hard on labor, and how the old laws of England tended rather to depress, debase, and enslave, than to encourage quicken and enlarge its interests. Other countries in Europe imitated this iniquitous and foolish policy; and it is only recently both in France and Germany that statutes prohibiting combinations and unions among workmen have been finally repealed. Anyone who desires to see how wretched and hopeless their condition was has only to read some history of the *Bauernkriegs* in Teuton lands and of their associates of other nationalities. We are aware of what has been written by Thornton, Wright, Hallam and others in the vain attempt to show that their condition was superior immediately following the establishment of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom to what it is now: we say vain; for the upshot of all they state is expressed in the

words of Mr. Thornton: "Although ruder means were employed to supply the wants of nature, every want was abundantly satisfied, which is far from being the case at present"—and this much can be affirmed with equal truth of slavery when it existed in the Southern States; but it is questionable whether the working classes would regard themselves or the cause of industry as being particularly improved or benefited by a return to a slave system more or less humanized. We are not arguing that the condition of our artisans and laborers is what it should be, and that in the changed circumstances of the times, they do not frequently find it difficult to keep the wolf from the door; but we are contending that the cause which they represent was never more honored, more potent, and even more praised and courted than it is in this latter part of the nineteenth century. Governments are studying the problems which it presents; philanthropists are seeking to lighten its burdens; statesmen are anxious for its alliance and support; poets are extolling its heroes, and are eulogizing its conquests; and, above all the voices busy with its affairs, its own voice sounds loudly, pleadingly, sometimes commandingly, assured by a multitude of indications that the world must hear. It has come to be recognized that Society rests to a great extent on industry, that kings cannot despise it nor republics get along without it; and its importance in modern civilization seems to surpass every other human aim and pursuit. That extraordinary and virulent evils should beset its position, however deplorable, is not unnatural,—these were to be expected;—but they no more disprove the genuineness of its high rank in the estimation of the age, than the evils which have developed with modern liberty prove that it is inferior to the liberty of the ancients. Formerly the artisan forged the iron for the baron's shield, tempered the steel for his sword, fashioned his coat of mail, reared him bastions,

dungeons, and frowning keeps; and as frequently was slain by the weapons he had made and sighed his life out in the prisons he had built. But it was impossible that he should continue forever a stranger to the power he possessed, and which was so monstrously perverted by his feudal chiefs. He gradually came to realize that everything depended on himself, that nature only furnished the raw material and that his hand gave it form and usefulness; that Society must perish without him, and that, therefore, he was of more worth than an absolute monarchy would allow, or an idle aristocracy admit. From the moment such a thought was thought industry was exalted. The struggle was inevitable: the thought must grow—did grow, until potentates and soldiers, philosophers and poets, and indeed enlightened and far-seeing men everywhere, came to acknowledge that she who had been treated as a serf was in reality a queen. That wealth should at times grow jealous of her power, seek to curb and restrain her energies, challenge some of the claims she puts forth, and in the rivalry surround her way with woeful spectacles of want and pain, is not strange, considering of what moral texture humanity is composed; but it is no more a sign of new degradation, or of the revival of the old, than the cross of Christ is evidence of personal weakness or dishonor.

Here we have progress; and in addition, a fruitful source of progress. To the changed and truer estimate of industry must be attributed the attainment in some degree at least, if not the origin, of several social improvements and advantages. It has had much to do with that marvelous multiplication of new cities and enlargement of old ones, which not a few poetic sentimentalists among us deplore; but which, notwithstanding the evils that thus far seem inseparable from them, have contributed to the vigorous growth of the arts of peace, and to the spread of

benign and humanizing principles. Even the cities of antiquity were renowned as the leaders of civilization, and to their influence the ancient world owed pretty much everything of value it possessed. Behind their walls liberty acquired its greatest strength, and in their streets letters and philosophy found their warmest friends. And modern cities assuredly equal, if they do not surpass them in all that promotes the intelligence, the ingenuity, the energy, and the refinement of mankind. That the wealth, splendor, and material magnificence of thronged metropolis and populous town may be traced to the new era in the history of industry is evident from the fact that many of these busy places are built on manufactories varied and extensive, while others rest, if not exclusively, yet mainly on the commerce which the products of labor, skilled and otherwise, render possible and needful. To this same cause must also be ascribed the astounding increase in capital, however that expressive term may be defined, which is one of the marked features of our age, and which in its turn when its obligations shall be understood and its employment be wisely and justly regulated, shall hasten the dawning of the better day. At present it is as the accumulated earnings of an ignorant, selfish man, which he knows not how to use, and which he is as likely to invest stupidly or wickedly as he is to invest them judiciously or righteously. The laws which govern capital, or should govern it, in the interests of Society, at the best are only dimly discerned, and the mind which controls it is not uninfluenced by sordidness; and hence it blunders fearfully and sins repeatedly; but, nevertheless, it has at its heart "the promise and potency" of nobler things, and in the coming time clearer heads and cleaner souls will know how to render it tributary to the general weal, and will joyfully put in practise what they know. In the meanwhile let us gratefully remember the important part which

industry has played in the creation of this same capital, a part which it did not and could not perform, as long as it was regarded as ignoble and was held in undeserved contempt; and let us cherish the hope that soon, very soon, Enlightenment sustained by Integrity will come our way, and will jointly solve the problems which now perplex us by their darkness and distress us by their sadness.

But in addition to these eminent services, industry, since its advent to power, and even from the hour when its importance was first forced on the attention of the modern world, has done much, indirectly if not directly, toward the recognition of man's equality before the law. This doctrine is one of the most beneficent in the political creeds of our times. As a sentiment it flashed upon the world in remote antiquity. As Sumner has shown, Herodotus (Book iii, § 80) touched on it in a single word; Demosthenes in his oration against Aristogiton alluded to it; Seneca (Epist. xxx) declared that the chief part of equity is equality, and, nearer to our own day, Milton, in poetic melody, sang of its blessed sway, and saw "With fair equality fraternal state." Christ prepared the way for the reception of this idea. It logically follows the solemn truths He enunciated. He taught that God is our common Father, sends rain and sunshine on all alike, opens Heaven's doors to all who desire to enter, and at last shall summon to His judgment-seat potentate and peasant, pope and priest, preacher and people. Surely, then, if there is no respect of persons before His throne, neither should there be before the tribunals of earth. The natural outcome of these radical views may be read in the mighty principle, almost axiomatic in America, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." What is thus expressed has been measurably realized in politics, though not to the same extent in social conditions; for, as

we shall see farther on, social inequalities have not yet been conquered even as far as they are conquerable. France followed America, and in the Constitution of June, 1795, put an end to privilege, and decreed that its citizens should be on the same level before the law. The charter of Louis Philippe, modifying what had been enacted before, yet distinctly declares: "Frenchmen are equal before the law, whatever may be their titles and ranks." In other continental nations and in England equality is either authoritatively affirmed or allowed, jurisprudence, theoretically at least, proceeding on the assumption of its truth. But what has industry had to do with this, and in what way has its emancipation from contumely advanced the triumph, as far as it has triumphed, of this principle? Were not Diderot, D'Alembert, and Jean Jacques Rousseau the men who were foremost during the eighteenth century in calling public attention to its reasonableness? These questions will naturally arise in the mind of the reader; and he will very likely also say to himself, "These men were not artisans and mechanics, but were only philosophers." True; and yet the connection concerning which these questions are asked, though not at first apparent, is very close and vital. These philosophers to a great extent were men of the people, and the vicissitudes of their early life made them familiar with the deplorable condition of the laboring classes. Rousseau, the son of a watchmaker of Geneva, and himself once a servant in a rich lady's household, and always poor, could advantageously study the pernicious results of inequality before the law. Diderot, though of respectable birth, was a good deal of a Bohemian, wandering about Paris as a bookseller's hack; and D'Alembert, the illegitimate offspring of the Chevalier Destouches, brought up as a foundling by the wife of a glazier, had abundant opportunity of knowing the ill effects of irresponsible power, and the discouraging and degrading influence of injustice on honest

toil. They were all reared in what may appropriately be called the shadows of industry, and were made to realize that the *Lettre de cachet*, so freely employed by the king and his favorites, was an instrument of tyranny fatal to the material prosperity of France. How far they were consciously moved by the wretchedness of the *Tiers état*, and by the contempt in which its pursuits were held, we can only guess; but their writings warrant the opinion that they were not unaffected by what they had seen and heard of these things when they enunciated a principle which undermined the stability of the *Ancien Régime*. They saw that the old order must give place to the new, that Society must be reconstructed or fall to pieces through sheer rottenness, and that to afford France the benefit of all her resources, and to quicken the energies of her thinkers and toilers in her behalf, equality before the law must be acknowledged and applied. We merely claim for industry that its low estate in their day, its wrongs and woes, rendered more vivid by impending national bankruptcy, helped to open the eyes and to stir the hearts of these brilliant writers, and suggested to them the remedy.

But this was in the period of its shame, or, at best of its struggling infancy. Since its growth in strength and honor, the services it has rendered the cause of human equality are more readily recognized. It has gone far toward establishing the right of all people to impartial consideration before the tribunals of justice; for it has shown that mechanics and laborers are as valuable to the State as merchants or soldiers, and are hence as much entitled to its protection and care. At the plow, the forge, the anvil, and the loom it has developed remarkable men, heroes, and benefactors, the peers of any who have been fostered by schools of learning or by the favor of kings; and thus having demonstrated that "honor and fame from no condition rise," and that humanity may be as great in

one set of circumstances as another, it has deepened the conviction everywhere that discriminations on the part of governments against labor and the laboring classes are iniquitous and insane. Adam Smith in *The Wealth of Nations* seems to argue that industry is the real source of national prosperity, and consequently insists that it should be freed from former shackles. Experience has substantiated his estimate and his theory. In proportion as industry has been emancipated from old-time disabilities has Society progressed; and as one of its most depressing burdens was lifted when equality before the law was ordained, by an easy process of logic the public mind has reached the unalterable conclusion that this equality is as necessary as it is righteous. Thus, then, has this fundamental principle been verified, commended, illustrated, and, as it were, illuminated and exalted, by the recent history of toil in its several departments; and thus have men been brought to realize more fully than in the past the injustice of caste and the indispensableness of brotherhood.

Nor is this all that the world owes to the influence of the agency whose mission we extol. According to Hume, it has cultivated enterprise and caution; according to Buckle, it has diminished superstition, as it has rendered us conscious of our own ability and responsibility; and according to Lecky it has undermined asceticism, checked ecclesiastical pretensions, and moderated the intolerance of conflicting creeds, as it has placed comforts within the reach of multitudes, has shown the superiority of its own power in comparison with the theatrical thunders of a Paganized Papalism, and has demonstrated that deeds are worth more than theories in the practical affairs of life. And if in these various ways it has served Society, we cannot afford to be indifferent to its legitimate claims. What it has done is pledge of what it is capable of doing in the future. We are bound, therefore, to maintain its

essential dignity, to abate the evils which impair its efficiency, to see that it has fair play in its rivalry with capital, and to attempt its rescue from the hands of agitators who in fact betray what they affect to defend. If this is the lesson taught the general public, those who are specially identified with its interests must also learn not to degrade them by sanctioning, or seeming to sanction, the rabid sentiments that found expression in the *salles* of the Redonte, and the 'Folie Belleville' during the year of grace 1868. Then it was declared by Socialistic fanatical spouters that "capital is accumulated shame," "that property is not theft, as it has been styled by a well-known writer, it is assassination," and "that the workman who saves his earnings is a traitor to his brethren." What is to be hoped from such rhapsodies as these? Were it possible to convert them into accepted rules of conduct, instead of bringing amelioration to the suffering masses they would be confirmed in their deplorable condition; endeavor would be ridiculed, morality would be abrogated, and all habits of frugality would be set aside; and as a result civilization would be utterly destroyed. No promise for anybody or anything in such a state of things, except for the devil and anarchy. Not even the humblest hod-carrier can find one ray of expectant comfort in the equality advocated by Molinari—"without distinction of industrial energy, talent, or virtue—absolute equality of wages, without distinction of quantity or quality of work—the value of all products of labor being solely estimated by *the time taken* to produce them." (See *Le Mouvement Socialiste*, p. 14.) Here we have radicalism with a vengeance; but it is that kind of radicalism which is as fatal to those who approve it as to those who reject. It is the programme of doomsday, and the harbinger of idleness, shiftlessness, unskillfulness, and of all the Pandemonium vices congenial to the heart of wild-flaming and wild-thundering lawlessness. Society has no

place, except it be in a Bedlam's pulpit, for such a discordant, drivelling, and screech-owlish gospel as this. No loadstar this, but cruel fantasm only. With such a soulless Frankenstein let industry form no alliances. If, however, it shall be deceived into doing so, it will not only stain its past record, but it will blight its own future; for if the shapeless, slouching deformity of an extreme Socialist's theory should be galvanized into life, like that other monster described by Mrs. Shelley made out of fragments picked up from churchyards and dissecting-rooms, it will turn and inflict dreadful retribution on every agency and calling that had to do with its creation.

Religious inspiration is the last of the special forces influencing and determining progress, to which serious consideration need be given in this discussion. As the words imply, we do not here refer exclusively to Christianity. That of course, and that preëminently, but not that alone. There have been other systems, and there are alleged revelations, Divine interpositions, Heavenly visions, with their hierarchies of flaming angels and their hosts of earthly marvel-workers. Whether any of these, or all of them, with Christianity added, deserve to be regarded as really supernatural in origin and substance, or only as shifting forms of the permanent Supernatural Mystery which streams through nature on humanity as "light breaks through the darkest cloud," it is not necessary for us to decide. We are not writing in the interest of any particular creed, whether it be true or false; but merely to record the fact that every nation has derived from its accepted and cherished worship an impulse, more or less pronounced, in the direction of progress. Hence it is that Goethe represents the ages of faith as the ages of greatest achievement and honor. And, corroborating this position, Max Müller writes "that the epochs in the world's history are marked not by the foundation or destruction of empires, by the migrations of races

or by French revolutions." "All this is outward history." "The real history of man," he continues, "is the history of religion; the wonderful ways by which the different families of the human race advanced toward a truer knowledge and a deeper love of God. This is the foundation that underlies all profane history; it is the light, the soul and the life of history, and without it all history would indeed be profane." Did not the appearance of Buddha in India mark the dawning of a new period of amelioration, although the ideas he set forth possessed not the vitality needful to carry it beyond a limited stage? Confucius in China unquestionably exerted a tremendous power over the public mind and modified the character of the empire through all subsequent time. Zarathustra, also called Zoroaster, with the Zend-Avesta reforming the Magian religion, imparted new though spasmodic life and activity to the Persian people. So, likewise, Pythagoras among the Greeks, regarded by some of his contemporaries as the son of Apollo or Pythios, quickened the intellect and conscience of his day, and his career was the beginning of radical changes and of vast improvements. Of his ministry Grote gives a distinct impression in this passage:

> His preaching and his conduct produced an effect almost electric upon the minds of the people, with an extensive reform public as well as private. Political discontent was repressed, incontinence disappeared, luxury became discredited, and the women hastened to change their golden ornaments for the simplest attire.—*Hist. Greece, vol. iv, p.* 546.

Mohammed, also, deserves to be classed with the leaders in the highest domain of thought and aspiration; and the date of his famous hegira, July 16, 622, gives us the starting point of that Moorish civilization which has probably found its warmest eulogist in Dr. John William Draper.

But among all of these great representatives of Faith, there is not one who can compare in greatness with Jesus

of Nazareth. He is, as Mill testifies, "unique," standing apart from all others, and above all others in spiritual sublimity. When placed by his side the "Long-haired Samian" with all his virtue is corrupt, Krishna is black indeed, Siddartha is dull and feeble, and the prophet of Allah is merely a grotesque fanatic. Whether he was really divine, or divinely-human is not the question here; but that he is the Incomparable One, whose advent indicates a new historical epoch, and imparts to progress a fresh and abiding impulse, the severest critics and most impartial judges are compelled to admit. The philosopher, Fichte, wrote of him: "He did more than all other philosophers in bringing heavenly morality into the hearts and homes of common men. Till the end of time, all the sensible will bow low before this Jesus of Nazareth, and all will humbly acknowledge the exceeding glory of this great phenomenon." Pecaut, a French author with no evangelical sympathies, declares that "Christ's moral character rose beyond comparison above that of any other great man of antiquity. No one was ever so gentle, so humble, so kind as he. In his spirit he lives in the house of his Heavenly Father. His moral life is wholly penetrated by God. He was the master of all because he was really their brother." Yet, more decisively, Richter, who was far from being orthodox in his theology, describes him as "the purest of the mighty, the mightiest of the pure, who, with his pierced hands, raised empires from their foundations, turned the stream of history from its old channels, and still continues to rule and guide the nations." Mathew Arnold admits that his "Spirit governs the course of humanity;" David Strauss asserts "that perfect piety is not possible without his presence in the heart"; and Diderot could not deny the permanence of his influence on mankind. Francis Cobbe, a disciple of Theodore Parker, adds his testimony in these words:

> The originator of the Christian movement must have been the greatest soul of his time, as of all time. * * * * The view which seems to be the sole fitting one for our estimate of the character of Christ, is that which regards him as the great REGENERATOR of humanity. His coming was to the life of humanity what regeneration is to the life of the individual. This is not a conclusion doubtfully deduced from questionable biographies, but a broad, plain inference from the universal history of our race. We may dispute all details; but the grand result is beyond criticism. The world *has* changed, and that change is historically traceable to Christ.

Such citations could be indefinitely multiplied, as they have been by Shedd in his *Person of Christ*, by Professor Townsend in his volume on *What Noted Men Think of Christ, etc., etc.*, and by Professor Tillett in *Christian Thought;* but these are sufficient for our purpose. All these writers fully substantiate what we have assumed—namely: that progress is largely indebted to religious inspiration; for how can it be true that Christ governs the course of humanity, does more than any one else to put heavenly morality in the hearts of common men, overthrows ancient empires, regenerates the race, and is the spring of all the wide-sweeping changes of modern world-history, if our position is not practically unassailable? We rest it, then, first of all, on their testimony; but more than this, they convince us also, that while every great religion has contributed in some way and in some degree, and originally if not continuously, to social advancement, Christianity surpasses them all in the strength, breadth, and permanence of its beneficent influence. The term "Christianity" is not here employed as synonymous with "churches," but as expressive of our Lord's spirit as far as it is manifest in them, and as it is preëminently reflected in the Holy Scriptures. And thus understood, we must recognize its superiority to all other faiths, unless the sentiments we have quoted are polite nothings; and thus believing we must go farther, and find the climax of our

reasoning in the majestic words of Daniel Webster: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering and to prosper; but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us, and bury all our glory in profound obscurity."

Undoubtedly to religious inspiration must be ascribed the treasures of art and song, and the more precious ideals of purity and nobility which enrich our struggling world. One cannot read Homer, Dante, Milton, Shakspeare, and the more recent poets, nor such philosophers as Socrates, Plato, and Descartes, without recognizing back of their gorgeous imagery, and interblending with their profoundest thoughts, influences that are not of earth. Strike out everything that points to belief in the supernatural, and all allusions that derive force and beauty from confidence in its reality, and the *caput mortuum* that will be left no one would care to preserve. Modern literature would also be wretchedly poor, desolate and barren, were the positively Christian element eliminated; and life itself would be dreary and unbearable were it irrevocably despoiled of faith in God, Christ, and immortality. Horace Binney Wallace, whose eloquent papers are now but little read, maintains that art is an emanation of the religious affections, and he argues that it "has always had an intimate connection with the character and degree of the religious sensibility of the people among whom it appeared." To which he adds:

> There is no instance in history of a signal manifestation of art-power, except among people, and in ages, where religious enthusiasm and religiousness of nature were prominent characteristics. And further, there is no instance of supreme excellence in art being reached, excepting where the subject of the artist's thoughts and toils—the type which he brought up to perfection—was to him an object of worship, or a sacred thing immediately connected with his holiest reverence.

Some admirable illustrations of these sentiments the reader will find in Ph. Fischer's *Spekul. Ethik*, and in Cousin's *True, Beautiful and Good*, and more recently in Ruskin's *Pleasures of England*. All of these noted writers substantially agree in regarding the triumphs of chisel and brush as being directly due to a breath from the unseen. And this is equally true of music as of sculpture and painting, the former being a special gift of Christianity. Ancient creeds and antique genius contributed but little to the world of tuneful sound which yields so much delight to modern ears. Harmony in reality sprang from the Cross, where God and man were brought into unison; and when this primal discord was being healed, music descended from heaven to earth and in time found for herself a voice in bell and organ, and broke forth at last in tender symphony, stately anthem, majestic oratorio, and in plaintive or victorious hymn. The new Faith was heralded by a chorus of angels, and humanity has been chorusing ever since, though not without harsh notes here and there—sometimes chanting softly, then loudly, sometimes sadly, but always hopefully and praisefully.

Beyond all this and more important, Christianity has quickened the moral life of Society—stupefied though it frequently is—by the principles it has revealed, by the sacred examples it has presented, and by the hopes it has kindled. In nothing is the far off past so different from the present as in the change which has taken place in man's estimate of conscience. Its reality, office and authority were scarcely appreciated by the generations which preceded Christ's ministry as they have been since. With us the moral sense is distinctly acknowledged; we claim that it should be sovereign in conduct; and though we are inexcusably and outrageously disloyal in numberless instances to its promptings, many of us are still filled with nameless fear and awful reverence

before its august tribunal. This is an immense gain over former ethical conceptions. Our standpoint at least is right, though our departures from it are frequent and flagrant. We ought to be better than the ancients, and better than we are; for we have in the Bible the clearest precepts for our guidance, and the loftiest motives for our encouragement in the path of duty. The most impartial judges, and even the most inveterate enemies, admit the incalculable value of the Holy Scriptures in the domain of morals, and if multitudes of the present generation are not righteous, it is owing to an unhappy revival of skepticism. Diderot, the infidel, who once called the Heavenly Oracles "the devil of a book" (*de ce diable de livre,*) on another occasion said: "No better lessons can I teach my child than those of the Bible." Thomas Jefferson, who is usually ranked with doubters, also wrote: "I have always said, and always will say, that the studious perusal of the sacred volume will make better citizens, better fathers, and better husbands." Goethe confesses his indebtedness to the Scriptures both in his literary and moral pursuits; John Ruskin has gracefully made a similar acknowledgment; and Professor Huxley, though in favor of secular education, admits that without them he does not see how the religious feeling, which is the essential basis of conduct, can be maintained.

Intimately connected with the ethical significance of Christianity must be ranked its elevating influence on industry. This has been adverted to in another place; but it is deserving of special mention here. Plato and Aristotle alike agreed in the view that "all common labor and trading are incompatible with true political virtue and prosperity." They said, "such a life is ignoble." (*Rep.* 1. 347, *and Polit. III.* 3, 2, *VIII.*) Cicero likewise wrote of it in contemptuous terms. (*Tusc. V.* 42*; de offic. I.* 42.) But on the other hand the Jewish faith treated it

with respect, and according to the proofs collected by Delitzsch, magnified its importance to the State. The doctrine of Christianity on the subject is expressed in *Eph. IV, 28; 1 Thess. IV, II; 2 Thess. III,,* 10–12; and these passages show the essential honorableness of toil and the everlasting shame of idleness and dependence. Potent have these teachings been in delivering the masses from their worst enemy—the sense of personal degradation when earning their living in the sweat of the brow. Well may we say of the relation of religion to manual labor what De Tocqueville has said of its connection with liberty: "Bible Christianity has been its companion in all conflicts, was the cradle of its infancy, and is the Divine source of its claims." But in addition to these practical benefits conferred on Society by this inspiring agency, we must not overlook its direct bearing on science. The men who have led in the exploration of nature have been incited in no small degree by their deep reverence for the Creator, and they have attributed their most notable discoveries to His aid. Pythagoras sacrificed a hecatomb to the gods when he arrived at his famous geometrical theorem concerning the squares of a right-angled triangle; Kepler was wild with praise when he concluded his demonstration of planetary motion; and other scientists, though sometimes counted infidels, have been as devout of soul as many who have been enrolled in the glorious company of the saints. This ground we know is considered debatable by many, and we are not disposed to dispute it with them. We know that the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward scientific research, and the hostility of some fossilized protestant preachers to its undoubted achievements, have prejudiced not a few candid and intelligent people against religion, and consequently they are blind to the services it has rendered to this department of inquiry. We can sympathize with them to

some extent, although we cannot agree with them, and sincerely believe they are in error. As we read history, from the time when the Chaldeans first lifted their eyes to the starry heavens, to the day when Bacon, father of material induction, taught that depth of attainment in natural philosophy would bring the mind back to God, we perceive a reverence for the Creator and His works which goes far to explain, what is otherwise unexplainable, the patient assiduity, and heroic courage, and unabated ardor of the men who have plucked knowledge from the dizzy heights of the universe, dug it up from the stony heart of the earth, and gathered it from every object near and remote, even pushing their ambitious conquests to the borders of the impenetrable. If some of their successors have lost this invigorating faith, and if some representatives of Christianity have ceased to sympathize with their sublime pursuit, we pity both; but the privation of the one and the opposition of the other can never obliterate the evidences that exist of the helpful and stimulating ministry gladly exercised by our holy religion on behalf of genuine science. But this point need not be pressed. Enough has been said on other aspects of the relation of spiritual forces to progress for us to believe with Jouffroy, *Melanges Philos. p.* 424, that "Christianity is the commencement of civilization and education to the uncivilized nations," and is a permanent source of betterment, emendation and refinement everywhere. And if this is the case, Society cannot safely dispense with its offices. To ridicule them, to revile them is to be guilty of a sin against humanity as well as against God.

So called Ethical culture can never compensate for what it would supplant. It is a sign of the disastrous outcome of Agnosticism that in proportion as it wins disciples, thinking people are hysterically shrieking notes of alarm regarding morality. They are asking how their children

are to acquire right principles of conduct, and whether there will be any such principles at all in the near future. No assuring replies yet have been made to their anxious inquiries; and so they are left to toss about on the waves of doubt, doubt fast rising to despair. We respectfully advise them to consult Martensen's *Systems der Moral-philosophie*, and there they will learn that "a moral philosophy which ignores Christianity, ignores also actual morality, and thus renders itself unpractical;" and we commend as wholesome the words of Rousseau in the *Troisiéme Lettre de la Montagne*, "I do not know why men insist on ascribing the excellent morality of our books to the progress of philosophy. This morality, which is derived from the gospel, was Christian before it was philosophical."

These sentiments contain the antidote needed to counteract the poison which antipathy to religion is injecting into modern life. If rectitude, honor, purity, and all the ennobling virtues are to flourish in this land and in others, they must be planted in the Faith which was bestowed by Christ as Heaven's richest gift to earth, and must be nourished by its grace. Nay, more than this, if order is to be preserved among the people, respect for the authority of civil law maintained, if resignation and contentment are to mitigate the pangs of the poor, and the fair hopes of immortal blessedness comfort them in tribulation, this Divine boon must neither be degraded nor discarded. Significant and awfully portentous are the bitter complaints and denunciations of the *Berlin Sozial-Demokrat*, *March* 12, 1865; and our would-be iconoclasts and our frenzied agitators had better lay the timely warning they contain to heart. We give them the benefit of the admonition in Taylor's translation of Luthardt:

> When the priesthood bowed the neck of mankind, it gave to the suffering son of man the kindly hope of another and a better world,

In all the misfortunes of life, in sorrow, need and sickness, a sweet hope was still left to a believing mind. But what is now the case? There are still poverty and privation, sorrow, need, and sickness. These are artificially enhanced and heaped up upon one class, while the pleasures and good things of the world combine to enrich the others * * * * * * What then have the favored of human society to offer to those millions, through whose sickness, increased by poverty and care, they enjoy the pleasures of earth? We tolerate no halfness and no expedients, we desire the full results, the whole truth. Ye wretched Pharisees of free churches, of liberal citizenship, who have deprived the people of the consolations of faith, and yet will not remove from them the iron yoke of your iron machines, where then is your logic? The logic of history is sterner than yours: the people have done with heaven—they are justified in claiming earth.

This is the language of desperation, and is bodeful of anarchy and bloodshed. Even a selfish priesthood, and a deformed type of Christianity, were more merciful and helpful than the soulless, godless civilization, or rather refined barbarism, projected by the enemies of Divine Revelation. Pure religion and undefiled, not only sustains by the promises of everlasting felicity, but by tender offices of love, promoting brotherhood and constraining the rich to remember the poor, brings with it to every community stability and peace. Unhappy, then, the day, if ever it should darkly dawn upon the world, when its altars shall be broken down, its temples be forsaken, and its humanizing teachings be discredited and despised. The extinction of the fires of ancient Greece, and the devastating rush of untamed hordes on imperial Rome would be nothing in comparison to the black night and savage madness that would overtake the nations were the light of the gospel to expire and the fierce Vandals and Huns of impiety triumph. We cannot believe in so dolorous an issue to all the consecrated endeavors of unnumbered saintly workers, nor can we imagine it possible for Providence to permit humanity to fall a suffering prey to the arts of hell; but yet, if we would avert

even the shadows of so dire a fate from the race let us not rest satisfied with this optimistic feeling of security. Rather, learning from the past that religious inspiration is indispensable to progress, let us heartily and diligently exert ourselves to preserve the institutions of Christianity from the assaults of misguided men, thus transmitting to the future the mightiest of all agencies for the regeneration and happiness of Society.

On the 22d of June, 1635, in the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, Galileo read his recantation and received his sentence. Tradition declares that after he had abjured, he whispered in silvery Italian: "*E pur si muove!*" What he almost inaudibly murmured in these bitter circumstances, we are prepared, in view of all the facts brought out in this discussion, to affirm distinctly and emphatically of the social world. It also moves: it has moved; and whatever the Solitary of Frankfort, and the Art professor of Oxford may say to the contrary, it is still moving, and must in the future move. The examination of the forces which have contributed to progress, as we have seen, witnesses to its reality and warrants the expectation of its continuance. In this confidence we may, therefore, rest; nay, more than this, sustained by this confidence we may earnestly labor to bring in the wished-for day which shall practically end the sore travail of humanity. But at this point we may be criticized for not including among the sources and means of advancement the beneficent power of association and the transforming might of revolution. We admit that something, perhaps much, can be said in their favor; and yet a little reflection will show that their claims are not of such a character as to warrant the same degree of attention as has been given in this paper to those of liberty, intelligence and religion. Let it be remembered that Society is itself primarily "association," and that in considering the causes of its development it would hardly

be logical to class itself. Were we writing of the elevation of man as man it would doubtless be eminently fitting to indicate clearly how far this has been promoted by intercommunication with his fellow-beings, and by the obligations and privileges of communal life. But as our argument proceeds on the supposition that he is a member of Society, and only in this relation concerns us, we have not felt called on to vindicate the intrinsic worth of "association" itself. A different course would have involved us in the useless task of proving the indispensableness of Society to the progress of Society; a position that may be assumed, just as we take for granted the actual existence of a body when we undertake to treat of its growth. Nevertheless, we concede that some associations within the community, such as some charity organizations, art guilds, trades unions, and some co-operative movements are highly important to the general welfare, and in the main are conducive to advancement. How far these may be advantageously encouraged, and what particular features must ever distinguish them if they are to be countenanced at all, need not here be determined. These inquiries will arise further on, and for the present we must rest content with this general acknowledgment of their value.

We are likewise constrained to dismiss the claims of revolutions with a very few remarks explanatory of our position regarding their influence. They have at times wrought or seem to have wrought wonderful changes, as in France when the old order was violently overthrown and a new state of things was inaugurated. The French revolution was indeed a sublime movement, and, with all the evils attending it, was the source of manifold blessings. But where it succeeded, how many similiar upheavals resulted only in disastrous failure, and how many more ended in worse than failure, being merely reactionary enterprises of tyrants by which the

people were rendered more helpless and wretched than ever. At best it can only be claimed that some revolutions have made for progress: many of them, alas! have made for retrogression. But when we have granted this much, it is still not clear whether the stormful uprising of the masses, with battlings at barricades, processionings of mobs waving ensanguined pikes, wholesale decapitations, and tragical trials of kings and nobles, can properly be regarded as a cause of advancement, or merely as a stage and phase of its history. Back of all such violent agitations there are ideas, hopes, plans, theories, philosophies, and these in the judgement of the best thinkers deserve to be credited with whatever of gain seems to proceed from strife and bloodshed. These may be compared to the brain, and revolutions to the hand; and as we attribute the effects wrought out by the hand to the brain, so we are evidently justified in ascribing progress primarily to the ideas which find expression in revolution, and only in a secondary sense to revolution itself. This doubt existing, we have not felt that we ought to class the fierce and terrible outbreaks of popular anger or enthusiasm with those permanent and uniform means by which Society has been steadily improved. Revolutions unquestionably are dangerous and uncertain experiments, and writers who become their eulogists should never forget that the praise which they pronounce so lavishly may mislead the ignorant, and may result in commotions as unwise as they are unnecessary. To extol them unduly would be to imitate that Paul Sarpi of Venice, who exclaimed "*Esto Perpetua*" when commending an infamous constitution; for it is to imply that they are abiding remedies for social wrongs and evils, and therefore may be relied on in almost every emergency. Such impressions are always to be deplored. They are pregnant with mischief, encouraging blatant and reckless agitators to incendiary words and deeds which threaten our common

peace and prosperity. For these reasons, therefore, we have challenged their right to rank with the moral and material forces which have been presented at length in this paper; and now most earnestly we entreat all who may peruse these pages to use their utmost endeavor to convince the populace in these times of restlessness and discontent, that what is yet to be attained can only be secured, as Milton wrote of glory—

> Without ambition, war, or violence,—
> By deeds of peace, by wisdom eminent,
> By patience, temperance.

The Hon. Charles Sumner, in an oration on the subject discussed in this chapter, gives some amusing illustrations of unyielding conservatism; and Herbert Spencer, in his *Study of Sociology*, points out the manifold difficulties in the way of any invention or improvement, even to the adoption of so simple a remedy as lemon juice for the scurvy. We cannot fail to smile at the antagonisms which they describe, though some of the incidents they relate, and others not related by them, may well move us to tears instead of to laughter. But whether humorous or pathetic, they alike serve to bring into relief what we should lay to heart as we close this chapter—the attitude we ought ourselves to assume. "Brother of Winchester," according to Sumner, said Cranmer to Lord Chancellor Gardyner, "you like not anything new, unless you be yourself the author thereof." "Your Grace wrongeth me," replied the prelate. "I have never been author yet of any one new thing; for which I thank my God." The same eloquent witness also points out how Sir Samuel Romilly's efforts to reform the jurisprudence of England were denounced as imperiling the criminal code of the realm; how Harvey lost his practice and was accounted crazy when he published his work on the circulation of the blood; how the proposals to light the streets toward the end of Charles the Second's

reign excited grave apprehensions; and how the *Quarterly Review*, on the application of steam to locomotion, ridiculed the idea that people would be insane enough to trust their lives to a machine rushing on at the rate of twenty miles an hour. Referring to steam recalls the struggles, disappointments and sufferings of the men who were among the first to discern its marvelous possibilities; and in all biography there is no career as sad and yet as sublime as that of the patient and laborious Fitch, whose bitter experiences drove him to a suicide's grave. All such cases as these come to us with one lesson—namely, the utter impossibility of staying the rush and sweep of progress. In the fullness of time discoveries, inventions, reforms vindicate themselves, and compel allegiance even on the part of those who have reviled them. Fortunes may be lost, hearts may be broken, and lives be sacrificed, but there is only one conceivable issue to the struggle. The new, if it is true, must supplant and overthrow the old, if it is false. Some way will be found to elude inquisitors and censors, some scheme hit on to defeat the lovers of darkness and to bring in the light. This is very happily illustrated by the course pursued by Jacquier and Le Seur, two members of the order of St. Francis, called Minimi, when they popularized the *Principia* of Newton. They prepared a commentary on the sublime discoveries of that philosopher; but the pope had forbidden any one to maintain his pernicious doctrines. How then could they publish and yet escape censure? How could they bow to the authority of the pope, and yet reveal to mankind the teachings of Newton? The expedient they adopted was simple, if not altogether ingenuous. They wrote a preface declaring that they submitted to the decision of their spiritual head that the sun moved round the earth, but that they had been incited by curiosity to show what would have been the state of affairs, had it been a truth instead

of a fiction, that the earth moved round the sun. Wise Franciscans, erudite friars, your sanctified cunning, if not entirely commendable, is at least excusable, and ought to convince inveterate conservatives that the arts and sciences will stride onward, and will find advocates where they are least suspected. The stream cannot be successfully resisted; how foolish, then, to interpose barriers which are bound to yield. Better go with the current, especially when it assuredly leads to calm, expansive seas and to cloudless skies. Doubtless it is wise not to embrace every proposal, not to abandon the old without investigation, and not to pull down hastily when we have no plans or material for building up. But this justifiable prudence is very different from the spirit of a Gardyner, which was blind to the advantages of departures from what time and custom had rendered venerable, if not sacred. The eye should be open to see, and the hand be ready to grasp whatever may advance the well-being of Society, and that, too, whether it appear in the domain of politics, science, or theology.

This should be our attitude. Toward things doubtful we should be conservative, toward everything proven radical. We should believe that the inventive force of humanity is not spent, and that the future must have developments as wondrous as any of the past. Our attitude should be one of expectancy and sympathy. We should look for new things, and should hold ourselves ready to accept them and coöperate with them. Nay, more than this, we should ourselves become critics of the old, and should be aggressive in our thoughts and deeds against every wrong, every error, and every evil. Unless the signs of the times deceive us, we are on the eve of remarkable events. Never were the appliances of civilization as numerous and varied as they are at present, never were our resources as great, and never were hopes of grand achievements as high as they are now. Amid all the noise and

confusion of traffic, and the wailing cries of suffering thousands, sound voices sweet with promise. The skies may be dark, but the sun is ascending toward the zenith; the voyage may be tempestuous, but the port-lights gleam just ahead; and the strife and clash may be intense and deafening, but the very earnestness of the conflict presages a speedy victory. To our stations then, whether at the helm to guide or on the field to fight. *Espérance et Dieu* be the motto of the age; and with this sentiment inscribed on our banners and inspiring our hearts, there can be no difficulties unconquerable and no blessings unattainable.

There's a fount about to stream,
There's a light about to beam,
There's a warmth about to glow,
There's a flower about to blow,
There's a midnight blackness changing
Into gray:
Men of thought, and men of action,
Clear the way!

Aid the dawning tongue and pen!
Aid it, hopes of honest men!
Aid it, paper! aid it type!
Aid it, for the hour is ripe,
And our earnest must not slacken
Into play:
Men of thought, and men of action,
Clear the way!

III.

THE INEQUALITIES OF SOCIETY.

And this to fill us with regard to man,
With apprehension of his passing worth,
Desire to work his proper nature out,
And ascertain his rank and final place;
For these things tend still upward—progress is
The law of life—man's self is not yet man!
Nor shall I deem his object served, his end
Attained, his genuine strength put fairly forth,
While only here and there a star dispels
The darkness, here and there a towering mind
O'erlooks its prostrate fellows; when the host
Is out at once to the despair of night,
When all mankind alike is perfected,
Equal in full-blown powers—then, not till then,
I say, begins man's general infancy!
For wherefore make account of feverish starts
Of restless members of a dormant whole—
Impatient nerves which quiver while the body
Slumbers as in a grave?

—*Robert Browning.*

THOUGH the moon is shadowy, to the unaided eye its surface appears to be smooth. This, however, is an illusion which the telescope speedily dissipates; for that instrument reveals a planet diversified by towering mountains rising from eight thousand to ten thousand feet above dreary plains, and by rugged valleys deepening from ten thousand to seventeen thousand feet, whose precipitous sides have been torn and scarred by volcanic fires. It is a sublime satellite, and yet a sorrowful one, one

whose yawning abysses, hideous cavities, and frightful chasms proclaim struggles of stupendous magnitude and convulsions of tragical destructiveness, such as our world has never witnessed, which have prevailed in the dateless past, and left behind the melancholy memorials of their power. Like the moon, our earth seen from a distance must present the aspect of a monotonous sphere, whose crust is unbroken and unfurrowed, and whose expressionless face is without form, and featureless. But drawing nearer this impression would cease, and it would be perceived that our globe is exceedingly rugged, uneven, irregular and multiform. We who live upon its bosom know the practically endless variety of its scenery, its savage wildernesses, its arcadian vales, its gloomy cañons, its dreary oceans of water and its drearier oceans of sand, its depressions almost excluding the light of day and its elevations straining for companionship with the stars of night. And these physical inequalities, these extremes of height and depth, of length and breadth, and of radiance and darkness, find unhappy correspondences in human Society which have grown up among them, and which to some extent have taken on their likeness. The social is a counterpart of the material; the configurations of the one are reproduced in the other. There are doubtless many who never think of these resemblances—men and women whose tastes and pursuits separate them as far from the actualities of life as this planet is distanced from the moon, and who see the diversities of the one as they see the shadows of the other. They withdraw from close contact with their fellow-beings, have no particular interest in their welfare, shut out every unpleasant fact, and give themselves over to dreamy views of happy uniformities and blissful harmonies. Such people are as self-deceived as they who should permit themselves to be misled by lunar appearances.

It is indeed true, as we have shown, that in politics

the rigidity of caste has been successfully relaxed, and the outrageous discriminations of former ages have been legally abolished. We all have a voice in the administration of civil affairs, or may have if we wish, and many have who might just as well be silent for all the good they do the nation. This much is achieved, but in a different direction much remains to be accomplished. And as we approach the special topic of this and the succeeding chapter we pause irresolute; for what we have to write is so soul-harrowing that we hesitate lest it should seem that the progress we have described is hardly worth the name when so many evils have been left untouched. But we must on, however painful the task. The fact is, and we may as well confront it first as last, Society, though far in advance of what it was centuries ago, is rifted and rent from one end to the other by manifold inequalities. When this is said, distinctions which are the outgrowth of civil government are not referred to; for these are necessary to the maintenance of law and order, and in a sense, are representative of the entire people. It is reasonable that there should be rulers, magistrates and other officers of State; for as Shakespeare has expressed it—

> The heavens themselves, the planets and this center,
> Observe degree, priority, and place, * * *
> Office and custom, in all line of order * * *
> Take but degree away, untune that string,
> And hark, what discord follows! each thing meets
> In mere oppugnancy.

But while it is eminently fitting that there be chieftancy for the administration of public affairs, it does not seem either reasonable or fitting that men, and whole classes of men, should be separated from each other by differences as radical as those which divide the frigid from the torrid zone. Impressive and instructive that scene in the Wood of Senart when a luxurious Louis, royally ca-

parisoned for hunting, met a wretched peasant with a coffin. "For whom?" inquires the gorgeous sportsman. Carlyle, whose words we quote, says, "For a poor brother slave, whom majesty had sometimes noticed slaving in those quarters. 'What did he die of?' 'Of hunger.' The king gave his steed the spur." Sad is it that such a contrast was ever possible on earth, and sadder still that it may yet be witnessed even in this enlightened and philanthropic land. A writer in the July number, 1882, of *The Atlantic Monthly* represents the president of the Wabash railroad exhibiting to a group of friends his $28,000,000 of Western Union stock, $12,000,000 of Missouri Pacific stock, $8,000,000 of Elevated railroad stocks and bonds, $10,000,000 of Wabash common and preferred, and some additional $20,000,000 invested in various securities; and the writer tells us, while this successful speculator was spreading out his millions, a day laborer in the employ of his company, whose wages had been kept back that a dividend might be paid its members, said to a reporter that he and his family were on the verge of starvation; and another, an infirm old man, in reply to questions, answered, "My rent is $6 a month; my groceries are $18. This leaves us $1 a month for clothing, medicines and other necessaries. My pay is $25 a month, and I have to wait two months for that." Surely the scene in the Wood of Senart is not more marked by light and shade than this. And yet this is but one example of social inequality which can easily and indefinitely be duplicated.

The New York correspondent of the *Troy Times* presents the following picture of the extremes which make up the Rembrandt-like existence of our metropolis:

> Four women were arraigned in the police court for selling vegetables and matches in baskets on the streets. One of the number said she was a widow with two children, and that this was her only support. The magistrate replied that as it was a violation of law he was

obliged to fine them $10 apiece, and as they were conveyed to the prison one of them fainted.

Speaking of incomes, Moses Taylor is rated $400,000 a year. He has no sons and his daughters are all married. Ex-Governor Morgan is estimated at $500,000 a year. Russell Sage is rated at a million to a million and a half, while Jay Gould's income cannot be less than half a dozen millions. To come down to smaller men, R. L. Stewart has nearly a million a year, while Robert and Ogden Goelet are each rated at $250,000. Bennett is reckoned at $600,000. D. O. Mills figures at $200,000, and the young Vanderbilts (Wm. K. and Cornelius) are not much below him. The estate of A. T. Stewart & Co. has an income of a million, which renders Cornelia Stewart the richest widow in America. The Astors (John Jacob and William) are estimated each at a million and a half, while William H. Vanderbilt probably has five times that sum; and yet within five minutes' walk of the place where these men live one can find multitudes whose life is but a prolonged battle with famine.

And while on the subject of incomes it may serve "to point a moral," if not "to adorn a tale," for us to glance at some of those which reward the endeavors of earnest toilers. We have alluded to the large amount of money Mrs. Stewart yearly receives, let us now notice the wretchedly small sums which some other women have to live on. The facts which we give are gathered and condensed from a long and carefully prepared article published in a Chicago paper. For finishing shirts women are paid from seven cents to ten cents a dozen, and for this pittance they have to put on each garment four stays or gussets, at least three buttons, and one ticket; that is, for seven cents they have to sew in forty-eight stays, and sew on thirty-six buttons and twelve cards. Then these workers receive sixty cents a dozen for ladies' calico sacques, articles which they have themselves to cut out, and which have nine seams each and a hem all round, with collar and cuffs in addition, and some eight buttons and buttonholes. Five cents apiece, just think of it, for all this labor! The persons who make men's drawers are paid

forty-five cents a dozen, for which they sew three seams in each pair, put on a double stitched waistband, hem the bottoms, attach buckles and straps and two buttons. For finishing men's trousers they earn twelve cents a pair, and an experienced hand can finish from twelve to sixteen pairs a week; and for making eighteen cloaks they get $2.50 when they are ready to be sold. These prices speak for themselves. They indicate that all available time must be devoted to the special work undertaken for enough money to be earned to provide the bare necessities of life, and that there can scarcely be leisure found in which to wash, scrub, clean and cook.

From the third annual report of the *Bureau of Statistics of Labor of New York* for the year 1885, we gain an insight into the miseries endured by multitudes of these women, whose only crime is poverty. Commissioner Charles F. Peck writes:

During one of my visits to a tenement house in New York city I inadvertently entered a room on the attic floor of a wretched old rookery on Hester street, and found myself in the midst of a lot of cloakmakers. The room was possibly ten feet square. The ceiling was low and slanting, and its only source of light was through the begrimed panes of glass of a small gable window opening out from the roof. In these cramped quarters were six women and four sewing machines. Piled up on the floor were stacks of cloaks ready to be put together. The air was stifling to one not accustomed to a temperature well up in the nineties and odoriferous with sewer gases. The women were scantily clad, their hair was unkempt, and their pale, abject countenances, as they bent over their work, formed a picture of physical suffering and want that I certainly had never seen before and trust that I may never again be compelled to look upon. They were working as if driven by some unseen power, but when I learned that they were enabled to earn but fifty cents for sixteen and perhaps more hours' labor per day, it needed no further investigation to convince me that the "unseen power" was the necessity of bread for their own and children's mouths. The style and quality of the cloaks upon which these women were at work was of the latest and best. They were lined with quilted satin or silk and

trimmed with sealskin or other expensive material, and found ready sale in the largest retail stores in the city at from $35 to $75 each. Two of these women could manage, by long hours and the most diligent application, to turn out one cloak per day, and the price they received from the contractor, or more probably "sweater," was $1—fifty cents a piece. Inquiry elicited the fact that the strong smell of sewer gas, which seemed to permeate every crevice in the broken plaster that still hung in patches on the walls and filled the room with a sickening stench, came from a sink in the adjoining apartment. Curiosity led me to venture within this "inside" room. It was without ventilation or light, save that which came through the door connecting it with the front room, and it was only after standing several minutes that I could distinguish the black lines of the walls and sink from which rose in clouds the deadly gas. Upon the floor was spread a mattress, which, in appearance, partook of the general filth to be found throughout the whole building, from the cellar up; and it was upon such a bed and in such quarters that three cloak-makers, tired and weary with the long day's work, and with scanty, if any, supper, threw themselves down to sleep and awaited the coming day's awful toil for bread. This is not a fancy picture, nor is it an exceptional case. Hundreds of similar and even worse character are to be found scattered through the city of New York.

One of these unfortunate victims of our competitive and cheapening age affords us an additional view of the difficulties and hardships of American working women. In reply to a newspaper reporter she says:

What do we eat? O dear, not very much—not enough to give one the gout, I assure you. I earn $2.40 a week, and the rent of my machine brings it up to $2.65. Out of this I pay 75 cents for rent, and 40 cents for coal and wood, which leaves me $1.50 for food, clothes, medicine, car-fare, theater tickets, and a box at the opera. Seriously, though, I buy a quarter of a pound of tea, a half-pound of sugar, one pound oatmeal, one pint of beans, two ten-cent loaves of bread, one soupbone, and perhaps it costs a couple of cents a week for salt, pepper, and herbs for my soup. I buy a quarter of a pound of butter a week, and sometimes I get a little milk for my tea. The things I have enumerated generally form my bill of fare for a week. I take tea and bread for breakfast, and have beef-soup two days from one bone, and soup two days from the beans. I have tea and

bread for supper. I forgot to say that I buy half a pound of liver for Sunday, and half a pound of bacon some other day. *Once in a while I buy a quart of potatoes*, which I bake in the place of the liver. The oatmeal, I forgot to mention, I cook and eat cold for breakfast, for I cannot work hard all day without something more nourishing than tea and bread. I spend about a $1.25 for food, and it costs me four cents a week for kerosene. I must save and pinch very closely to be able to buy shoes and clothes. Only that I had some I don't know what I should do. I don't know how the other women get along. Sometimes four and even six club together and pay room rent, and they say they find it costs less for food; but I am not sure about that. I never waste a particle of food, and I think if I had it I could even eat more than I do, and I doubt if they get it cheaper than I do.

As to the groceries—well, I think if Vanderbilt had to pay for all the food used in his house at the same ruinous rates he would be bankrupt in a year, for the smaller you subdivide the articles the more they seem to cost. For instance, a pound of oatmeal is six cents, a half-pound costs you four; a pint of beans is eight cents, while a whole quart costs twelve.

There is something touchingly pathetic in this account of a struggle for existence, and appallingly wide the gulf that separates the women who are doomed to it and the affluent females who idle away their time in palatial mansions on Fifth avenue, and who spend more each week on their poodle dogs than their wretched sisters are able to earn. This gulf reminds us of another, quite impassable, too, for eternity has its aristocracy as well as time; only with the difference that there Dives and Lazarus have changed places.

But sharp and sad as these contrasts are we are assured by various writers that they are sharper and sadder in Europe than in America. It is claimed that in other portions of the world the condition of the toiling masses is not as comfortable as it is here. By way of proof it is said that in this country only one person in two hundred and eighty-five is a pauper, while in England there is one in thirty-five. Moreover, John Bright, in his

Rochdale speech, 1863, especially deplored the absence of hope from the heart of England's laboring multitudes—a regret that has more recently been voiced by William Morris—while he extolled the United States where such hope prevails, as there a career is open to every one, and no one feels that he is necessarily doomed to penury and obscurity. Froude gives an equally cheerless picture of the old world. He says that a million persons own the soil of Great Britain, that the House of Lords possesses more than a third of its entire area, and that the great estates are continually devouring the small estates adjoining them. The actual figures as given by statistical authority are 1,104,967 persons out of a population numbering over 30,000,000 divide between them in very unequal portions 51,960,208 acres. We can readily understand how this state of things must discourage the people, how it must arrest ambition and how it must continually lead to idleness and pauperism. But while it may be true, as is confidently affirmed, that the extremes of wretchedness are not as common in America as in Europe, nevertheless even here they are bad enough, and very closely resemble in kind, if not in degree, those that prevail on the other side of the Atlantic. The new world seems to be going beyond the old in the matter of vast estates. For instance, there are only three persons in England who own over 100,000 acres each, and not one of them has a property of 200,000 acres, and their names are the Duke of Cleveland, Duke of Devonshire and the Duke of Northumberland. But in this favored land we have individuals who own 700,000 acres, and one or two whose realty embraces upward of 4,000,000 acres. There are, however, not wanting signs that this tendency toward concentration must soon reach its limit, and that a reaction is inevitable. Doubtless in time both England and America will tread in the footsteps of France and

moderate freeholds be the rule; but until then, what trials, sufferings and losses must be endured by a large portion of the population. These, too, will continue with little abatement as long as tenant-farming prevails as extensively as it does at present. If we may believe Moody, there are a million and a quarter of these farms in the United States, or two hundred thousand more than exist in Great Britain and Ireland; and if we are to credit the figures of the Commissioner appointed by the *North American Review* this evil has attained portentious and threatening dimensions. We are aware that his statements have been called in question and their accuracy challenged by two writers in the March number (1886) of this leading monthly, and that consequently in the con fusing array of contradictory estimates it is difficult to arrive at an unassailable conclusion. While Mr. Moody may exaggerate, assuredly the argument against the report of the *North American's* Commissioner is not decisive; for its author admits that we have no means of knowing the relative proportion of tenants today, and that the present drift of land titles cannot be determined owing to defects in the census reports prior to 1880. His own position, possibly, like that of the other party to the discussion, is not impregnable. But be that as it may, this mischievous landlordism is extensive enough to awaken the liveliest solicitude. All of the writers we have referred to deplore its rootage in our soil. On this point there is no practical difference of opinion. We are hopeful that this bane is to prove transient. But who can tell? Certainly as long as it thrives our citizens will feel an increasing dislike for agricultural pursuits; they will prefer their chances in the city to the hopelessness of the country, and thus wretchedness and privation will be perpetuated; and unless a positive reform is inaugurated speedily our people in some

districts may experience a fate similar to the Crofters of Scotland, many of whom have been driven from their homes to provide wealthy individuals with deer parks. Thus, then, while in several respects this nation may offer, as John Bright intimated, a more encouraging field to the industrious poor than the old world, there is, after all, much that is painfully alike in both. Here as there, with the growth of land monopolies, we have had the crowding of our cities, and the overcrowding, too, with all the horrors that implies. As the Marquis of Ailesbury and Lord Londesborough have each over 50,000 acres, and have that extent of room in which to breathe and exercise, so the barons of our Plutocracy possess, or can possess, an equal area for their refreshment and delight; and *per contra,* as thousands of wretched beings on foreign shores are huddled together in close, stifling rooms, where reeking, malodorous filth pollutes and poisons, so on these; especially in New York, where, as we are told, one hundred thousand human beings are packed and crammed together within the limits of one square mile. And here as in other countries, there are thousands upon thousands who are compelled to pay the highest price for the articles they consume, who have not enough money to purchase decency, and who have no reason to anticipate anything but hunger, cold and death. Many are like the unfortunate woman described by Charlotte Bronte in the pathetic lines:

> And oh! full oft, quite spent and weary,
> Her hand will pause, her head decline;
> That labor seems so hard and dreary
> On which no ray of hope may shine.

And while these toiling and oftentimes suffering poor are inadequately provided for, near by, as in London and Paris, are hundreds who own larger houses than they can occupy, many more millions than they can spend,

and who have a superabundance of all things which can add pleasure and zest to life.

Not uncommonly the recital of these dolorous distinctions is resented by those whose lot is happily cast in the sunshine, as tending to faulty estimates of our times. These persons have no reason to be dissatisfied, and they cannot imagine why any one else should be. In their opinion the evils of Society are exaggerated by a class of sentimentalists like Kingsley, Carlyle and Ruskin, who are nothing if not rhetorical. Carried away by their feelings such writers as these, it is claimed, misrepresent the actual condition of affairs by coloring too highly and luridly the misfortunes of a portion of the community. Undoubtedly, it is allowed, they are actuated by philanthropic motives; but they are too emotional to give a reliable account of what they see, and too poetic for their judgments to pass unchallenged. Perhaps it is not unnatural for the prospered and favored to think in this way of those who try to render vivid the sorrowful extremes of modern life; but they are radically wrong in supposing that preachers, art-lecturers and prose-poets are the only ones who do so. This is not the case. Cool-headed and far-seeing statesmen, and well-informed political economists, substantially corroborate and confirm all that has been written regarding the woeful condition of the masses by the most sympathetic and partial of their friends. The most thoughtful and the least impressible among the men who mold public opinion agree in expressing the conviction that, however the toiling multitudes may have been benefited by recent civilization, they certainly have not been benefited in proportion to the increase of production, nor commensurate with the share they have had in developing the extraordinary riches of the age. On this point let us hear Mr. Gladstone, who in the House of Commons, February 14, 1843, spoke in these terms:

It is one of the sad sides of the present social order in our land that the steady increase of wealth of the upper classes and the accumulation of capital should be attended with a diminution in the people's power of consumption, and with a larger amount of privation and suffering among the poor.

The same idea he repeated April 16, 1863. His words then were:

From the year 1842 to 1853 the receipts from the income tax increased six per cent in England, and from 1853 to 1861 twenty per cent. It is an astonishing fact, but it is nevertheless true, that this prodigious increase of wealth benefited solely the well-to-do classes.

And Henry Fawcett (*Essays and Lectures*) echoes in effect the same representation when he writes:

Production has increased quite beyond the most sanguine hopes, and yet the day when the workman shall obtain a large share of this increase seems as far distant as ever, and in his miserable abode the struggle against want and misery is as hard as it ever was. The result of this is to create a feeling of profound hostility to the fundamental principles on which society is based.

These are strong and startling testimonies, and quite as radical as any penned by the so-called "impracticals." What Mr. Fawcett means when he says, that the distance of the workman from the fruit of his toil "creates a profound feeling of hostility to the fundamental principles on which Society is based," has been illustrated by the preference avowed by John Stuart Mill, who, though usually calm and dispassionate, has recorded it in this vigorous manner:

If, therefore, the choice were to be made betweeen Communism, with all its chances, and the present state of society, with all its sufferings and injustices—if the institution of private property necessarily carried with it, as a consequence, that the produce of labor shall be apportioned, as we now see it, almost in an inverse ratio to the labor, the largest portion to those who have never worked at all, the next largest to those whose work is almost nominal, and so in a descending scale, the remuneration dwindling as the work grows

harder and more disagreeable, until the most fatiguing and exhausting bodily labor cannot count with certainty on being able to earn even the necessaries of life—if this or Communism were the alternative, all the difficulties, great or small, of Communism would be as dust in the balance.—*Principles, b. ii, c. i,* § *3.*

What more has the most emotional writers, or the most excited of modern agitators, ever said? This language certainly justifies the dark picture we have drawn of social extremes, and used by such a man as Mr. Mill dispels the notion entertained by easy-going, comfortable and self-complacent souls, that we are given to wholesale and reckless exaggerations.

But we have not yet exhausted the list of inequalities which are a disgrace to this enlightened age. Those already described, bad as they are, are not the only ones, and probably are not the worst. There are others which grow out of these, and which are not easily characterized; but perhaps an illustration or two will make them plain. We read not long since that a Glasgow bank director, convicted of having appropriated something like a half-million sterling, was sentenced to eight months imprisonment; and that on the same day a little, half-starved boy, charged with stealing a cake worth half a penny, was sentenced to fourteen days hard labor and four years in a reformatory. This is English justice; and another specimen of its blindness in the case of abject poverty was reported in a recent journal. The journal states that a man seventy years of age, paralyzed in speech and limbs, was sentenced for begging to three months hard labor, but that death happily interposed and saved him from the penalty. It is likewise chronicled by Thomas Wright, in his book entitled *Our New Masters,* that when in England an effort was made to put in force an "unrepealed statute of that godly monarch, Charles the Second, which made it an offense at law for any man to

ply his ordinary avocation on a Sunday," sundry costermongers and itinerant venders of water-cresses, periwinkles and other cheap articles favored by the poor were arrested and convicted; but that the coachmen of the lord mayor and the Marquis of Lorne were not condemned, though guilty of pursuing their calling on that day, as rigor in their case would have annoyed their affluent masters. Discriminations of this kind, however, are not confined to England. They are frequent in all civilized lands, and are not uncommon in our own. When in New York an attempt was made to enforce the Sabbath ordinance it was, as in London, newsdealers, bootblacks, and others who earn a precarious living who were the sufferers, while the well-to-do persons who violated the law were permitted to go scot-free. Thoughtful people have grown distrustful of justice in these United States; for they cannot help but see how difficult, if not impossible, it is to convict a man who has ample resources. He may be a murderer and a villain who has wronged widows and orphans out of their possessions, but if he only has money enough he can generally laugh at the hangman and defy the penitentiary. A pauper who should be guilty of such crimes would very speedily be made an example of, to deter other beggars like himself from imitating their superiors. If a sewing-woman is defrauded by her employer, if wages are not paid to workmen according to agreement, if contracts are broken, and if laboring people are slandered and abused, redress they practically have none. They can't afford to go to the courts with their case; they know that justice is a marketable commodity, and that it is a luxury far beyond their means, and so they must submit to the inevitable. Hence it is that an ugly saying is on many lips, a saying that is a discredit to republican institutions—"that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor"; and so it is, for, though all classes exist under the

same code, its execution is not directed impartially, and seems to be governed by no principle of exact and unvarying justice. This condition of things is horrible and humiliating. While, Emile De Lavelye has pointed out, it is superior to that of the middle ages, when the serf suffered from the violence and brutality of great lords whose tyranny was rarely checked by the State, till it is fearful and appalling, demanding immediate attention and efficient remedies.

But what ought to be done? Let us see if we can discover.

The most radical answer comes from Socialism, and as that theory is the most conspicuous and belligerent of any now before the world, it has the first claim on our attention, and ought to have the first place in this discussion. We recognize this priority, and shall therefore examine its premises, weigh its assurances, and determine whether at heart it has the promise of genuine equality, or is entirely mischievous and misleading. At the outset of this inquiry we perceive a difficulty which we may not be able to escape. We refer to certain very extreme views which are held by Socialists; rejected indeed by some, but by others regarded as essential features of their creed. They can hardly be overlooked in a definition without offense, neither can they be introduced without a protest. In this dilemma the best course will be to ascertain what is common to the word "Socialism" as used by all its contending partisans, then glance in the course of our argument at its variations, and so arrive at a judgment as to whether its principles are of any value to the community or not.

Fundamentally the term under consideration denotes "Mutualism" in contradistinction to egoistic "individualism," and suggests the thought that oneness of spirit and companionship in effort are indispensable to the

amelioration of Society. This, let us bear in mind, is primarily a Gospel conception, and against it no valid objection can be brought. We read in the New Testament that we are to bear one another's burdens and so to fulfill the law of Christ. Love is there enjoined as the bond of perfectness, and as the source of hope. The rich are there described as the stewards of God, as his servants intrusted with material treasures, not to be lavished on themselves, but to be conscientiously employed for the advantage of the unfortunate and destitute. Such an ideal of brotherhood as this is surely beyond criticism, and were it really supreme in the practical affairs of the world social conditions would in a large measure be equalized; for then there would be more unity and less separateness, more coöperation and less competition, and there would be more justice and less injustice. If this is all that is meant by Socialism, every soul ought to glory in being classed with its supporters; and if this is all, then Jesus Christ himself was its truest exponent and indeed was its founder. He lived for others, gave himself for others, died for others, and entreated others to imitate his example. Dim vision of this relation of the Jewish peasant-prophet to social regeneration had some of the Parisian Communists in 1850. In some of their halls might then be seen the picture of that sacred form, and underneath this significant inscription, "First Representative of the People." They felt that in a real sense he was allied to them, that he, too, desired the emancipation of humanity, and though they did not see how different their plans were from his, they yet looked up to him as their friend and leader. Like the Master and in the same way, all who are in truth his followers have at heart the common weal, and hence if this is all the Socialistic name imports, as Proudhon intimates it is, then are they entitled to bear it, and none more entitled than they. Be it understood then, we have no controversy

with this use of the word. But, as we all must be aware, it is not usually employed in this loose and general way. It commonly, and always when persons are trying to speak accurately, stands for a particular school of Economical Science, a school which, if we may credit Deputy Joerg in the German Parliament, has been making extraordinary progress during the past few years. The peculiarities of this sect are, first, Mutualism; secondly, Mutualism, not in spirit and effort only, but with more or less completeness, in property and remuneration; and, thirdly, Mutualism carried into effect through the medium of law, or in other words, arranged and maintained by government. This definition we have purposely made as broad as possible consistent with faithfulness, so as to afford a place for every variety and phase of thought which legitimately may claim to be embraced in it. Socialism as thus understood, not as a spirit, but as a method, we cannot but regard as open to serious objections, which ought to be carefully pondered before its principles are finally avowed.

It should be remembered that this system is no novelty born of modern radicalism, but has come down to us from a respectable antiquity. It appeared during the decline of Hellenism, and again when the Roman Republic was tottering to its overthrow. Roscher says, "The speeches of the Gracchi, and in a far ruder fashion, the conspiracy of Catiline, remind us of the catchworks of modern Socialism." Moreover, it is a remarkable fact that whenever Society has been unusually depraved, divided, distressed, many earnest philanthropists have looked to this "ism" for relief, and even some Christians have apparently regarded it with favor. There is something of the faubourg Communist in John Chrysostom when he declares that it would be preferable for all things to be in common; and we almost seem to be near the Paris barricades of 1848, or in the Hotel de Ville during the siege of 1871, when we

hear the pious Jerome exclaiming, "Opulence is always the result of theft," and the saintly Clement arguing that "if justice were enforced there would be a general division of property, private possession being an iniquitous thing." This language warrants the inference that these brethren had a good degree of confidence in the principle of "Mutualism" as an antidote for public ills. Perhaps it was impossible for them to feel otherwise, having the example of the Apostolic Church before them, in the New Testament, where everything had been in common. It was natural that they should regard with approval the extension of a practice which for a time at least had worked very admirably. But let it not be forgotten that what was done by the disciples at Jerusalem was done voluntarily. No one compelled them to do as they did, particularly the State did not coerce them. Is it not, therefore, very likely that these venerable men when they advocated a general division of property had in view a voluntary surrender, and not a government confiscation? From what is known of them it is not probable that they would have gone as far as some do now, and have recommended that the possessions of the rich should be taken by so-called process of law, and be conferred on those who very likely would not know how to keep them. These Christian fathers, in our judgment, had no more intention of teaching such a doctrine as this than Bossuet had when in his sermon on *The Dignity of the Church's Poor* he gave expression to the following radical sentiments:

"I came," says the Saviour, "to preach the Gospel to the poor." *Evangelisare pauperibus misit me.* The rich are tolerated if they assist the poor. In the primitive church everything was in common, so that none should be guilty of leaving another in want. For what injustice, my brethren, that the poor should bear the full burden, that the whole weight of misery should fall on their shoulders! If they complain and murmur against Divine providence—Lord! let me say it—it is not without some appearance of justice; for as we are all

made in the same fashion and there is but little difference between mud and mud, why do we see on one side joy, honor and affluence, and on the other sorrow and despair, excessive want, and often, too, thraldom and contempt.

But though it is not probable that these reverend fathers were Socialists of the type conspicuous in various countries to-day, they yet afford an interesting illustration of the tendency common in almost every age to seek refuge in some form of "Mutualism" from the wrongs and woes of life. As it has been, so is it now. Sign this, many persons may suppose, that current anarchical theories if applied would indeed renovate and bless Society. So we might hope, were it not that experiments in this direction have never been remarkably successful, and have never in any perceptible degree diminished the sum of human sorrow. This has been unhappily proven over and over again, as in the case of the Millenarians, Cenobites, Begging Friars, Taborites, Levellers, and what is more to our purpose, in that of the French labor organization of 1848, when the effort to establish government workshops and regulate capital thrust 100,000 unemployed men on the streets of Paris. Yet in the face of multiplied failures along this line, thousands of intelligent people are apparently anxious to repeat on a much larger scale the mistakes of the past. They still imagine that Socialism and the Millenium are synonymous terms, and that the adoption of the system described by the former would assuredly introduce the state symbolized by the latter. This childlike confidence is doubtless to be admired, but it is no pledge or guaranty that it will ever be justified. The constantly recurring appeal to that which has never yet done anything to inspire trust is no evidence that it has "the promise and potency" of a brighter future at its heart; but is rather the humilating proof of man's blunders and discouragements, which, in spite of his

better judgement, drive him to a political faith whose special and only distinct attraction is that it antagonizes with and threatens to destroy the present prevailing creed, from the operations of which he continually suffers, and for the defects of which he has been unable to provide a remedy. It is simply another instance of a "forlorn hope"—something like the case of a sailor who heads his ship toward the rocks, though every other vessel that has been steered in that direction has gone to pieces, because he cannot see how to weather the storm, or how to live in it; and because he is wearied and disheartened and desperately thinks that he had better risk the peril than remain as he is. The rocks may prove more hospitable than the troubled ocean; and in existing circumstances, he knows not what else to do.

Yet better do almost anything else than this. Yes, "better bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of"; or, as the quotation is not quite apt, "to others," which, from the knowledge we already have of them, John Stuart Mill to the contrary notwithstanding, must prove infinitely more disastrous than any we are now called on to endure. We do not think that we are doing Socialism an injustice by this seemingly harsh statement; for the closer we scrutinize its teachings, and the nearer we come to its advocates, the more deeply we are impressed with its eminent unfitness to reform the institutions of the age. Its charm lies wholly on the surface and is exceedingly superficial. The head and the soul of it are thoroughly deranged, and are totally at fault in their plans and their expectations. Nay, more, we are persuaded that this conviction will be shared even by the skeptical, if they will only take the trouble to examine the disclosures made in various lands and by different parties of its real character and influence. In aiding all interested in this subject to perform so necessary

a work we would recall for a moment the unfavorable estimate of its worth created by some of its historic developments. Roscher writes: "A social revolution of the most fearful kind, by which a great part of all private property passed into the hands of those who hitherto had had no possessions (the soldiers), and knew not how to administer it, happened twice during the Roman Republic, viz, under Sylla and the second Triumvirate." The language which he here employs to describe this revolution is fully justified by the annals of the period referred to. It was, indeed, "of the most fearful kind," carrying dismay and distress to thousands, and failing at almost every point to accomplish permanent good. But if we come nearer to our own times and study the effects of this "political superstition," as it was preached by Thomas Münzer in Germany, with its motto "*omnia simul communia*," we shall see in the bloody and licentious saturnalia of Westphalia—in which, however, the prophet had no part, as happily for his own sake he had been beheaded before it was inaugurated, but which was a legitimate outcome of his radical doctrine—an illustration of its perniciousness and destructiveness. Nor do we receive a more favorable impression of its value from its peculiar and vigorous growth on French soil. In 1782 Brissot de Warville originated the phrase, afterward employed by Proudhon, *Propriété c'est le vol;* and in the name of equality, we suppose, commended the temporary union of sexes which prevails among animalistic tribes, Babœuf in 1796 headed a wretched conspiracy in behalf of a community of goods and of labor. One Sylvain Maréchal also exclaimed, "We wish real equality or death. The French revolution is only the precurser of another much greater, more solemn and the final one. Let all the arts perish if need be, provided real equality remains for us. * * * No more individual property in lands. The land

belongs to no person. We demand, we seek the common enjoyment of the fruits of the soil. The fruits are for all the world." This fanatic undoubtedly expressed the real spirit of Communism in the stormful times of Napoleon, and there is no reason for supposing that it has grown more conservative in this latter part of the nineteenth century. Indeed, a representative of this delusion from Germany has in various ways indicated its substantial agreement with opinions loudly proclaimed a hundred years ago in Europe. We reproduce a conversation published in the *New York World* between a reporter and Herr Most, the party referred to, and who is not inappropriately called "THE APOSTLE OF ANARCHY." This conversation will not only give to the reader a clear conception of what Socialism is, but will establish its consanguinity with theories as old as the dreams of Plato. The interview proceeds in this manner:

"Herr Most, to what school of socialists do you belong?"

"I believe in the theory of the Carl Marx school and the practice of tactics of the anarchists. I am a thorough believer in the commune."

"What is communism?"

"I should give you a book to answer that question. Communism is the ownership of everything by everybody. For instance, take all the ironworkers in the country — workmen, superintendents, agents — every one connected with iron. Well, they should own all the works and all the iron. There should be no capitalists, no men for whom other men work. The land of the country should be owned by the people, the manufactures by those interested in them. If all the people work, very little work by each man will be enough. Each man should have an equal interest in the production of all, and all should have an interest in the work of each one."

"How could the commune get the necessary capital for such a state of things?"

"As the workmen to-day are only paid enough to keep body and soul together, they can never raise the capital themselves. But if the socialists once get political power they will confiscate the money

now in the hands of the capitalists for the benefit of the new society. That is communism — the only just political arrangement."

"Suppose that communism existed and you and I were working. Suppose you chose to work harder than I worked, would you get more money?"

"That is one of the great difficulties. My party believe that pure communism would embrace the rights of the minority as well as those of the majority. If the minority worked harder than the majority, then they would have more. Why not? Why could there not be two societies, the majority and the minority, each having its own?"

"But that does not answer my question. Suppose you worked harder; you have always been a hardworking man, I believe?"

"I have always worked hard."

"Well, then, suppose you worked harder than I did, would you be a minority of one — would you get more money than what came to me?"

"Why should I work harder than you? If I have all that I want and know that my children would be educated by the state or by society, why should I work hard?"

"But suppose that you did, in spite of all the reasons you would have for not doing so, would you get more money? In other words, would the reward for effort under the commune be in proportion to the effort?"

"As I said, that is one of the difficulties about which the leaders in the movement are not decided. It is a detail which can be settled by and by when the commune is established, and I cannot answer the question yet."

"Does the section of the socialists to which you belong believe in assassination?"

"That is another very difficult question. Take the case of Russia. One man's will governs eighty or ninety millions of people. Should that man be insane or peevish or bad-tempered he can cause untold suffering. He can get up in the morning and order ten thousand people exiled to Siberia. Such a man is a monster, and I believe that a monster should be put to death, whether he has two legs, four legs, or six legs. I think that the killing of the czar was an act of justice, and that it should not be called assassination, but self-defense. Think of the misery that man caused. If he could have died a hundred times it would not have been a tithe of what he deserved."

"To go a step further, is assassination justifiable in a constitutional government?"

"I do not know exactly what you mean."

"Suppose the socialists wished to overturn the government of England. Suppose that the queen was killed to-morrow, the prince of Wales the next day, his eldest son the next, and that is kept up for ten days. At the end of that time it would be safe to say there would be no persons willing to accept the crown of England. Would such a thing be justifiable from a socialistic standpoint?"

"Such a series of killing would be an impossibility."

"Of course it would be impossible; but if it were possible, would it be justifiable? In other words, do the socialists think terrorism a justifiable weapon to use?"

"Terrorism such as you describe would be justifiable if the socialists could through it obtain power. Anything is justifiable by means of which the commune could be established."

These sentiments recall a scene in Shakespeare's play of *Henry VI, ii Part.* Referring to the insurrection under Jack Cade the dramatist represents a messenger as saying of the rebels:

> All scholars, lawyers, courtiers, gentlemen,
> They call false caterpillars, and intend their death.

Then into the mouth of Cade himself, to whom it is likely the poet has not done historic justice, he puts the words;

> I thank you, good people; there shall be no money; all shall eat and drink on my score, and I will apparel them all in one livery, that they may agree like brothers, and worship me, their lord.

Precisely so. Somebody *must* be lord. There must be administration, and hence masters and sub-masters, and we need not be surprised if Jack Cade or Herr Most covets the dignity. Proudhon shows that we inevitably would have a new form of the old evil were we to adopt the programme of Cade and his sympathizers; for in the radical changes which it proposes, "inequality would spring from placing mediocrity on a level with excellence."

Such a "damaging equation," as he terms it, "would simply pull down those who are up, without lifting up those who are down." Herbert Spencer, in his pamphlet entitled *Man versus The State*, indicates that the poet is not very far out of the way in his picture of what the ambitious leader of social levelism states so bluntly. "Our Synthetic Philosopher," as Mr. Spencer has been called, argues, and that, too, very conclusively, that the Socialistic movement, instead of equalizing, would inevitably tend toward slavery. On this point we have already quoted Mr. Spencer when examining the sources of progress; but there is another passage of the same general tenor which may be read with profit.

> What is essential to the idea of a slave? We primarily think of him as one who is owned by another. To be more than nominal, however, the ownership must be shown by control of the slave's actions—a control which is habitually for the benefit of the controller. That which fundamentally distinguishes the slave is that he labors under coercion to satisfy another's desires. The relation admits of sundry gradations. * * *
>
> If all the slave's labor is for his owner the slavery is heavy, and if but little it is light. Take, now, a further step. Suppose an owner dies, and his estate with its slaves comes into the hands of trustees; or suppose the estate and everything on it to be bought by a company: is the condition of the slave any the better if the amount of his compulsory labor remains the same. Suppose that for a company we substitute the community; does it make any difference to the slave if the time he has to work for others is as great, and the time left for himself is as small, as before? The essential question is—How much is he compelled to labor for other benefit than his own, and how much can he labor for his own benefit? The degree of his slavery varies according to the ratio between that which he is forced to yield up and that which he is allowed to retain; and it matters not whether his master is a single person or a society. If, without option, he has to labor for the society, and receives from the general stock such portion as the society awards him, he becomes a slave to the society. Socialistic arrangements necessitate an enslavement of this kind; and toward such an enslavement many recent measures, and still more the measures advocated, are carrying us.

David Dudley Field goes a step even beyond this, and in the July number, 1885, of *The North American Review*. referring to Mr. George's particular theory, of which we shall say something very soon, points out a danger that would be incurred by accumulating in the coffers of the State as much money as the actual working of his plan would inevitably commit to its keeping. It would have to be collected and disbursed, and he argues this "would tend to the corruption of the government beyond all former precedent." This peril would necessarily increase in proportion as the government's oversight and management were extended to all departments of industry and property, as would be the case in unadulterated Socialism, and the end, judging from what is known of humanity, would probably be, not merely a despotism, but a rascally despotism at that.

There are other objections to the Science of Society advocated by such men as Herr Most which press themselves on the attention of thoughtful people, and which ought to be considered here. First of all, the more it is studied, the more deadly will its influence appear on diligence and enterprise. Elliott, the rhymer, has some very striking lines on the Communist's character, which are significant:

> What is a communist? One who hath yearnings
> For equal division of unequal earnings;
> Idler or bungler, he's one who is willing
> To fork out his penny and pocket your shilling.

Then he gives us this conception of his prayer:

> Lord send us weeks of Sundays,
> A saint's day every day!
> Shirts gratis, ditto breeches,
> Less work and double pay!

To some of our readers this description may seem a burlesque; but if they will reflect for a moment it will grow

on them as a faithful portraiture. If the State is to care for everybody is it not reasonable to expect that many "bodies" will simply fall back on their protector, and supinely rely on this blessed agency to feed, clothe and house them? Wendell Philips once said that the minority under existing arrangements has to think and work for the majority, and this majority very likely would increase indefinitely were it accepted as a fundamental principle that it could transfer the responsibility for its welfare to the government. A premium this offered improvidence and shiftlessness. What a delightful Paradise Society would become for Lazzaroni and Gaberlunzie men, and for the whole tattered fraternity of idlers and beggars who believe that "the world owes them a living" under the benign auspices of State Paternalism. If it shall be said, no such Paradise would open to these parasites, as they would be compelled to work under the new *régime*, even if punishment had to be inflicted; then what an edifying spectacle would be presented in the name of equality of one portion of the dear people driving slave-like, with scourgings manifold, the other portion to their toil. And then suppose these good-for-nothings would not be driven, as probably they would not, what a Millenium of insurrection, bloodshed, and finally of anarchy would ensue. The workings of this political hallucination would unquestionably speedily put an end to equality; or rather it would never have any beginning; and if there was equality at all, it would be that of the slimy pond with never the possibility of a grand billow to break the dreary monotony of its surface. For why should there be enterprise when there could be no reward? and without enterprise Society would be malariously stagnant. The motto of St. Simon, who, by the way, is frequently misunderstood or maligned, was "to each one according to his capacity, to each capacity according to its work."

This is a sound saying, but obnoxious to the revolutionary school we are considering, which would reward all alike, whether great or small, useful or useless. Strictly adhered to there could be no encouragements, no honors, no mighty inducements to exceptional endeavors. Even as it is, some, if not all, Trades-Unions stand in their own light by advocating the right of the most worthless workmen to the same pay as that earned by the best. Their standard of excellence in many instances is determined by the dilatory and unskillful; and, consequently, labor of every kind is temporarily deteriorating in quality. This is one of the significant facts of the times, concerning which these words were written, in substance if not exactly as quoted, by one of the brilliant minds of England:

> You will see a strong, stout laborer dawdling over his task as a sick man with a spark of spirit in him would be ashamed to dawdle, laying a brick daintily here, and another there, and stopping to have a look at it and chat with a comrade before he lays another. There are those, however, in the same gang who would lay their bricks at double the rate, if they dared. Who is to hinder them? It is the man who works next to them of whom they are afraid. If they show undue diligence they are reported to the Union, and a black mark is put against their names, as they are making it harder for the lazy ones to live. The sons of industry are afraid of industry, lest lazy, worthless loons should be forced to work or starve. O men! things have come near to their end when ye organize idleness and make it your god. So long as ye yield to such a blighting tyranny ye are making it more difficult for your class to rise!

But if it is mischievous for a body of people to be organized on such a principle, how ruinous it would be for the community as a whole to adopt it as fundamental to its existence. It would be the paralysis of energy, the arrest of progress. No one would be stimulated to excel his neighbor, and the ambition of all would be to do less than others, not more. Discoveries, inventions and improvements would be next to impossible, and only stolidity and stupidity would be at a premium.

Moreover this scheme may be legitimately objected to on strictly moral grounds. It would be legalized robbery; for the earnings of the deserving would be taken to enrich the undeserving, and this would lead to a bitter sense of wrong and outrage. As the friends of St. Simon said during the memorable controversy of 1830, community of goods "would be a greater act of violence, a more outrageous injustice, than the unequal division which originally was brought about by the power of arms and by conquest." To inaugurate such a state of things there would have to be wholesale spoliation, and this would simply be the public recognition of theft as one of the cardinal virtues. That such spoliation is seriously contemplated in our day is proven by the latest utterances of *The Freiheit*, an International organ. In an article headed "The Last Argument" we have these incendiary threats:

> The proletariat are determined to make the coming war the final war at all hazards. Their object must be to wound the bourgeoisie where it is mortal—this place is their property. The coming revolution will not go far before it can be determined whether property can be confiscated for the common good or not. If it can, all the better. If not, property must be destroyed. We say *property* in general, for little would be accomplished by destroying public property and fragments of private property. Whatever the bourgeoisie is it is by capital; without capital it is nothing. If, therefore, capital cannot be secured, and if the terrible prospect should be that reaction should again celebrate its orgies over the bodies of the revolutionists, then there can be no hesitating. General destruction must be proclaimed and practiced without favor. It was by these tactics the Teutonic tribes conquered Rome and Russia and vanquished the elder Napoleon. There is no remedy against this policy. The revolutionists of the past have tried to gain a footing in the big cities, and if they could not hold them they were massacred in their streets. In the future such cities as cannot be defended must simply be destroyed, and so thoroughly that not a stone remains in its place. If one hundred thousand men cannot accomplish anything in open battle, a few hundreds of resolute people can envelop in flames a city however large. What the hands of proletarians have erected they have a right to pull down.

If this brigandage and incendiarism are to be countenanced, that the condition of the people may be equalized, why may not the individual, if he shall squander his portion of the goods stolen during the panic attending this promised conflagration in riotous living, plunder his neighbor for his own special advantage? If what my fellow-citizen has is mine, and if what I have is his, what is to restrain me from wasting what is his, and then demanding in peremptory tones what he admits is my own? It may be answered, "law." Well, but the enforcement of law largely depends on public sentiment in its favor, and this theory supposes in the first place the education of the community down to the idea that dishonesty is honest. With such ethical confusion once introduced what is to prevent it spreading until all moral distinctions are obliterated? We have been taught to believe that the producer has some kind of property-right in the thing produced, and that what he earns he really owns; and that he cannot be deprived of this without being made the victim of a crime. Is this sound doctrine or is it not? The wisest men say that it is. Would not the triumph of Socialism be the reverse of this judgment? In our opinion it would; for the sense of obligation and responsibility must be seriously diminished if we lose sight of the duties we owe to private property. If we were to set aside the teachings of the most enlightened nations on this subject, the sovereignty of obligation in general would decline, and it would soon come to pass that, as the rights of individuals in their possessions were disregarded, so the authority of elected superiors and officials would also be ignored. The sequence any one can portray, and we presume few persons will claim that it would present fewer miseries and less demoralization than confront us to-day.

Among other dire results it may safely be assumed that the degradation of woman would be conspicuous. "The

ownership of everything by everybody" would come to include humanity. Community of wives is not regarded by many Socialists as an illogical deduction from community of property. Indeed, we are not left simply to imagine what would be the outcome of their principles were they really applied; for some of them have anticipated their workings with great precision, and with candor equally great have informed the world what kind of heaven they propose for women in the new era. Observe, we do not accuse all of them of entertaining pernicious sentiments on this subject — only some — but those who do indicate the true drift of their system. This drift was expressed by Hasenclever, one of Lassalle's associates in the German Workingmen's Union, when he said:

> In the communistic state, where the community bears the obligation of educating and maintaining the children, where no private capital subsists, but all instruments of production are common property, the woman need no longer, out of respect to her children, be legally chained to one man. The bond between the sexes will be simply a moral one, and then such a bond, if the characters did not harmonize, could be dissolved.

During the same meeting Jörissen substantially said, that a maiden who disposed freely of her love was no prostitute — she was the free wife of the future. In the state of the future only love should direct the union of the sexes. Between the married wife and the so-called prostitute there is only a quantitive difference. (See Jäger's *Socialismus*, as quoted by Dr. Woolsey.) And Annie Besant, in the *National Reformer*, June 4, 1876, gives the Secularists' conception of marriage, which also reflects the belief of the better class of Socialists. She writes:

> It is perfectly true that marriage is different as regarded from the Secularist and from the Christian point of view. The Secularist reverences marriage, but he regards marriage as something far higher than a union "blessed" by a minister; he considers, also, that marriage should be terminable, like any other contract, when it fails in

its object, and becomes injurious instead of beneficial; he does not despise human passion, or pretend that he has no body; on the contrary, reverencing nature, he regards physical union as perfecting the union of heart and mind, and sees in the complete unity of marriage the possibility of a far higher and nobler humanity than either man or woman can attain in a state of celibacy.

Not unexpectedly we find connected with these sentiments a deep and widespread antipathy to the supernatural. Christianity, especially historical Christianity, is usually derided and discarded by the uncompromising Socialist. Schaeffle, certainly a competent witness, declares, that "the Socialism of to-day is through and through irreligious and hostile to the Church." The same idea appears in Cabet's *Voyage en Icarie*, where the most radical doctrines are promulgated. And Karl Marx writes that the German theory starts "with the decisive, positive abolition of religion," and adds:

> The critique of religion ends with the doctrine that man is the highest being for men; and thus with the categorical imperative of overthrowing all relations in which man is a degraded, enslaved, forsaken, contemptible being; relations which one cannot better describe than by the exclamation of a Frenchman on occasion of a projected dog-tax: "Poor dogs! they are going to treat you like men."

The Communistic revolution in Paris, 1871, while, accurately speaking, not avowedly a revolt of those holding to the economic views which bear this name, was yet thoroughly imbued with their spirit and was thoroughly atheistic. Its leaders raged and swore against the Almighty, massacred priests, profaned churches, and did everything within the scope of devilish ingenuity to evince their contempt for all things sacred. Referring to the development of a kindred political party in Russia, Stepniak writes: "Absolute atheism is the sole inheritance that has been preserved intact by the new generation, and I need scarcely point out how much advantage the modern revolutionary movement has derived from it."

Also Dr. Draper, grouping together several radical classes of agitators, whose names differ, but whose fundamental ideas are pretty much the same, has this to say of their faith, or rather of their no-faith:

> What is it that has given birth to the Nihilist, the Communist, the Socialist? It is the total extinction of religious belief. With no spiritual prop to support them, no expectation of a hereafter in which the inequality of this life may be adjusted, angry at the cunningly devised net from which they have escaped, they have abandoned all hope of spiritual intervention in their behalf, and have undertaken to right their wrongs themselves.—(*Princeton Review*, January, 1879.)

This godless tendency is evidently very strong. We do not assert that it is absolutely inseparable from Socialism; for there have been those who have held firmly to its fundamental idea of "mutualism" and mutualism regulated by law, and yet have been sincere worshipers of God. But the point we make is that when the people commit themselves unreservedly to its doctrines they are in danger of breaking away from spiritual realities. Influenced by extreme opinions concerning the cure of social inequalities, many of them become fanatical, and begin to think of the unapproachable sovereignty of Jehovah with suspicion and jealousy; and as they cannot elevate themselves to his greatness, nor drag him down to their littleness, they undertake to abolish belief in his existence. They discern upon his person the insignia of a monarch, and as they have sworn death to royalty, they would assassinate him—if they could. Happily for the world he is beyond their reach, or we would speedily have a murdered deity and a vacant throne. Yet by this blind craze we are persuaded that many are carried away not so much through actual viciousness as through excessive devotion to an idea; just as the perfectionists of Oneida, though eminently pious, were betrayed into

"complex marriages" through their singular notions regarding property. They advanced the extraordinary doctrine that there "is no intrinsic difference between property in persons and property in things; and that the same spirit which abolished exclusiveness in regard to money would abolish, if circumstances allowed full scope to it, exclusiveness in regard to women and children." (See Nordhoff's *Communistic Societies of the United States*, pp. 271–2.) And just here culminates the utter failure of the scheme we are criticising. Whatever advantages may possibly spring from it, assuredly equality is not one. As we have seen, it cannot dispense with official rank and administrations, also that it must pull down the industrious to lift up the idle, and that this equation is a positive injustice to the former class; and we have discovered that it tends toward the subjection of woman almost to the condition of a slave, thereby contemplating inequality in one of its most objectionable forms; and concludes by sweeping away every vestige of a faith through which the little of human brotherhood witnessed in the world has been realized. It works, therefore, rather against equality than in its favor. And for this reason, if for none other, the large majority of intelligent people must regard it as a political extravaganza, a piece of clamorous charlatanism, as impracticable as it is inconsistent.

We have incidently referred to the land theory of Mr. Henry George, and as it is offered as a cure for the grievous disparities of our times its merits ought to be carefully pondered. Although it contains a Communistic element, we shall find it widely separated from the lawless schools of political economy which propose to subvert individuality and integrity alike. Mr. George does not discredit industry or honesty, neither does he carry "mutualism" so far as to annul all legitimate claims to

personal and private property. He is not to be classed with Herr Most, or with the yelling crowd who are looking for affluence through some legislative authorization of plunder. No; the author of the now famous book, *Progress and Poverty*, would simply have the territory of the nation held as the common property of the nation, practically, if not formally, abolishing private ownership. This he proposes to accomplish, not by confiscating land, but by confiscating rent. So far as his scheme bears on the subject of this discussion it may be well to hear from himself an expression, both of his plans and his hopes. We read, *p. 465*, and, also, on *p. 364:*

But the great cause of inequality is in the natural monopoly which is given by the possession of land. The first perceptions of men seem always to be that land is common property, but the rude devices by which this is at first recognized — such as annual partitions or cultivation in common — are only consistent with a low stage of development. The idea of property, which naturally arises with reference to things of human production, is easily transferred to land, and an institution which, when population is sparse, merely secures to the improver and user the due reward of his labor, finally, as population becomes dense and rent arises, operates to strip the producer of his wages. Not merely this, but the appropriation of rent for public purposes, which is the only way in which, with anything like a high development, land can be readily attained as common property, becomes, when political and religious power passes into the hands of a class, the ownership of the land by that class, and the rest of the community become merely tenants. And wars and conquests, which tend to the concentration of political power and to the institution of slavery, naturally result, where social growth has given land a value, in the appropriation of the soil. A dominant class, who concentrate power in their hands, will likewise soon concentrate ownership of the land. To them will fall large partitions of conquered land, which the former inhabitants will till as tenants or serfs, and the public domain, or common lands, which in the natural course of social growth are left for awhile in every country (and in which state the primitive system of village culture leaves pasture and woodland), are readily acquired, as we see by modern instances. And inequality once established, the ownership of land tends to concentrate as development goes on.

What I, therefore, propose, as the simple yet sovereign remedy, which will raise wages, increase the earnings of capital, extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen crime, elevate morals and taste and intelligence, purify government and carry civilization to yet nobler heights, is — *to appropriate rent by taxation.*

A further statement of his views we have in *The North American Review*, July, 1885, where, during a conversation with David Dudley Field, he says :

I hold that that which a man produces is rightfully his, and his alone; that it should not be taken from him for any purpose, even for public uses, so long as there is any public property that might be employed for that purpose ; and, therefore, I would exempt from taxation everything in the nature of capital, personal property or improvements, in short, that property which is the result of man's exertion. But I hold that land is not the rightful property of any individual. As you say again, "no one can have private property in privilege," and if the land belongs, as I hold it does belong, to all the people, the holding of any part of it is a privilege for which the individual holder should compensate the general owner according to the pecuniary value of the privilege. To exact this would not be to despoil any one of his rightful property, but to put an end to spoliation that now goes on. * * * I think immediately a substantial equality would be arrived at, such an equality as would do away with the spectacle of a man unable to find work, and would secure to all a good and easy living with a mere modicum of the hard labor and worriment now undergone by most of us.

We entertain the profoundest esteem for Mr. Henry George, both as a man and as a writer, and with the spirit manifested in his book and in his articles we sympathize, though we do not agree with the recommendations set forth, nor believe their enforcement would be as fertile in blessings as he supposes Like many others who try to originate remedies for crying evils, his judgment is bewildered by his invention, and he imagines that vastly more will come of it than is at all probable. Thus, when he claims that his proposed reform will "raise wages,

increase the earnings of capital, extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen crime, elevate morals and taste and intelligence, purify government," and in effect result in "substantial equality," we humbly suggest that he is attributing to it far more than in the nature of things it can accomplish. The ball is too big for the cannon. Possibly various advantages might accrue were the measures he defends so eloquently put in practice; but it requires credulity of oceanic extent and depth to subscribe sincerely to the expectation that a change in the nominal ownership of the soil, and State "appropriation of rent by taxation," would or could terminate the manifold ills which now alarm the civilized world. A little reflection on Mr. George's scheme we are persuaded will satisfy the candid inquirer that he has overestimated and overstated its value.

Let us remember that he founds his glowing hopes simply on a change of ownership. According to his plan the nation is henceforward to own the soil, and this is to be rented or taxed, the tax going to the common treasury, relieving the people of burdens, the plan also affording them an opportunity of leasing small, or comparatively small, holdings. The government would, of course, fix the amount of rent, and would have to decide between parties contending for the same estate; and on the other hand, would find itself controlling an immense amount of territory which no one would attempt to cultivate, on the ground that it would not be profitable. One can readily imagine the entanglement consequent on such a condition of things, and how greed—for Mr. George provides no remedy for that—would anger disappointed bidders for eligible farms and pasturage and desirable business stands; and how the population would be practically turned into one huge officeseeker, determined on gaining from the ad-

ministration the most fertile lands; and then one can easily perceive how brawls and violence might develop from these conflicting interests, and how, if they did not increase the corruption of public affairs, they certainly would not diminish it, and on either supposition would leave many of the evils which now afflict us intact. But let us take for granted that these almost unavoidable difficulties have been judiciously composed, and that a fair division of the national domain has been made, and at moderate prices, say, for no more than a fair equivalent for the advantages received; yet, even were this arrangement perfected, would it insure equality? Not necessarily. Is it not next to certain, men being constituted variously as they are, that some would cause their lands to yield twice as much as others, that they would also economize when others squandered, and so would lift themselves up into a well-to-do order, entirely separated from the less competent and the less frugal? It would likewise be inevitable that some would fail altogether, and would either have to be compelled by force to labor, and so form a kind of slave class, or be expelled from their holdings and so degenerate into a mendicant class. We have all seen this with more or less distinctness illustrated over and over again. We have known men possessed of farms the same in fertility, and yet while one steadily grew rich the other continually drifted toward poverty; his fields were untilled, his barns were neglected, and the place was a burden and expense. Others start in life with similar fortunes and with similar bright business prospects. We need not tell you that their paths frequently divide; that one goes upward toward increasing prosperity, and the other downward toward ever-deepening adversity. However equal their advantages at starting, however equally favoring their circumstances, they may drift as far apart as the poles; from which we learn that the disposition of land according to

the scheme of Mr. George would not necessarily insure the termination of social inequalities. It would no more do so than the alleged Spartan experiment in the same direction, which failed to equalize the condition of the Dorian conquerors, and which speedily came to an end; and neither would it inevitably do so any more than the system now in vogue; for, as we have seen, the essential difference between them is simply one of proprietorship—whether we shall rent, if we rent at all, of the State or of individuals; and experience goes to show that the condition of tenants is not wholly determined by their landlords, but in some good degree, at least, by their own character and abilities.

This is amply confirmed by what we know of those countries where the land is most generally divided, and where it is held on the easiest terms. In Russia, for instance, according to Stepniak, the peasants have "obscina" (rural commune), with the collective property of the land, and the "mir" or "gromeda" (communal assembly). Thus they not only have possession of the soil in a way approximating to the plan of Mr. George, but they also have machinery adapted to administer their rights in the most liberal fashion. Yet, notwithstanding these advantages, they are widely separated from the upper classes, have neither their privileges nor enjoyments. They are scorned and oppressed. If it is said that the continuance of their deplorable plight is due to taxation, the military service, vicious habits, and to the lack of education, we shall not dispute the statement; only let it not be forgotten that it intimates very clearly that something more than favorable land tenure is necessary to diminish social inequalities. The same inference may be drawn from other nations where landlordism is not prominent, and where its sway is least tyrannous. In France there are now about 2,000,000 properties under twelve and twenty-five acres, while there are only 150,000 above 100 acres. Of

the entire population there are 1,750,000 who are not tenants, and only 850,000 who cultivate the soil as tenants, and not more than 57,000 who employ foremen or stewards. This is a favorable showing. It may be matched by a similar subdivision in Belgium, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and extensive portions of Italy. But in these nations nothing like Mr. George's hopes are realized. Admitting that the peasantry under these governments in some things are better off than the rural population in England and America, still they are not exempt from the insolence of aristocracies and the inconveniences of poverty. Distinctions are as apparent there as here, and in no perceptible degree has individual ownership in France or the communal plan of Russia raised wages, increased the earnings of capital, extirpated pauperism, lessened crime, elevated morality, taste and intelligence. Why have the desirable conditions, approaching in spirit to those advocated by our gifted author, signally failed to realize the blessings he predicts so confidently. The explanation we believe is to be found not only in the overshadowing curse of certain institutions, but in the character and habits of the soil-tillers themselves; and if this is so, then it follows that Mr. George's scheme taken by itself, even were it feasible, would be grievously disappointing in its outcome. That scheme plus something else might do good; but then the question arises whether that "something else" might not accomplish as much good, and by a method less revolutionary. We believe that it would.

We are convinced that any radical departure from the fundamental principle underlying land ownership in America would be injurious to society. However it has been abused, and however liable to abuse, it is in our judgment, on the whole, superior to the substitute elaborated in the volume on *Progress and Poverty*. In saying this we do not deny that the entire territory of a country in

reality belongs in proprietary right to the people at large. It is a maxim of English law that there is no such thing in our system as an absolute private ownership of property in land. The supreme title even now is vested in the State, and the individual has only a strictly defined subordinate claim, subject to conditions from time to time enacted by the representatives of the community. (See *Encyclo. Britan.*, article *Land.*) This being the case, the citizens of a nation can both legally and morally modify or radically alter the terms upon which its broad fields may be cultivated and developed. If, therefore, they were disposed to do so, they could, after paying suitable compensation to those who have on the faith of the government and the stability of its present order invested money in the soil, adopt the recommendations of Mr. George, and do so without invading or destroying any personal rights whatever. Mr. Herbert Spencer enthusiastically indorses this position, and in language somewhat strong, and possibly in some respects misleading, extols its advantages. He says, as quoted by Mr. George:

> Such a doctrine is consistent with the highest state of civilization; may be carried out without involving a community of goods, and need cause no very serious revolution in existing arrangements. The change required would simply be a change of landlords. Separate ownership would merge into the joint-stock ownership of the public. Instead of being in the possession of individuals, the country would be held by the great corporate body—society. Instead of leasing his acres from an isolated proprietor, the farmer would lease them from the nation. Instead of paying his rent to the agent of Sir John or his Grace, he would pay it to an agent or deputy agent of the community. Stewards would be public officials instead of private ones, and tenancy the only land tenure. A state of things so ordered would be in perfect harmony with the moral law. Under it all men would be equally landlords; all men would be alike free to become tenants. * * * Clearly, therefore, on such a system, the earth might be inclosed, occupied and cultivated in entire subordination to the law of equal freedom.

The reader will perceive that Mr. Spencer is specially drawn to the proposed new departure by the change it is to make in landlords, substituting the State, as is suggested, for private individuals. This he evidently regards as full of promise, and as the chief thing to be accomplished. Yet Mr. Spencer has devoted scores of pages of his well-known *Study of Sociology* and *Man versus The State* to the congenial task of showing that of all agencies for the wise and successful conduct of public affairs the nation's officials are the poorest. And now in this paragraph he turns completely round and commends substantially what he has in other places condemned. He would have us believe, what he has, over and over again. very conclusively disproved, that the government would make a wiser, better and kinder landlord than private citizens, singly or as corporations. We cannot go with him. His own arguments against this belief have convinced us that it is untenable. So far as we are concerned we are not in favor of any landlords at all, whether they are individuals or the state. We would have it possible for every man to own a place according to the present system, by which, though he has a claim subordinate to the supreme will of the people constitutionally expressed, it is a real claim, one that he can transmit to others, and of which he can only be deprived by due process of law. It is said that the system now in vogue originated with the Romans, from whom it has descended to us. This, we presume, will not be denied; and surely it ought not to prejudice us against it. Those astute legislators had an opportunity to observe the working of the opposite system among the Germans, and the fact that they discarded it goes very far toward proving that they did not regard it as conducive to industry, prosperity and the happiness of Society. That is, they rejected the communal for the individual idea, and we are not convinced by anything

Mr. George has written that they did wrong. But whether they did or not, we repeat it, we would if we could abolish odious landlordism altogether. We are radical on this point. A rented place, whether the lessor is or is not a government representative, can never be a home in quite the sense that a house is that is owned. The same care is never bestowed on the former that we lavish on the latter; and it is questionable whether any number of fine-sounding words could quite prevail to induce us to make the same improvements on the first as on the second. Neglected farms, slovenly agriculture and wretched husbandry would very probably mark the new tenantry method, and evils suppressed in one form would doubtless revive, and perhaps more virulently, in another. If the authorities managed their land department as they do other departments there would have to be regulations and conditions which would have to be respected, and as there is nothing more certain than that they would frequently be ignored, evictions would be frequent, and the discontent which is now felt toward individuals would break out against the State.

Moreover, it has been found that the hope of owning something, especially a home, has been one of the mightiest forces for good in the history of progress. It has often been said that very little of Communism is retained in the nature of a man who has come into the possession of even a small estate. Such a person talks differently, feels differently. He has something to lose, and he suddenly becomes conservative. So, also, when there is reasonable expectation of gaining anything; energy, enterprise, industry, and other virtues interwoven inextricably with the public welfare, are evoked and strengthened by the anticipation of compensation in the shape of property for the family. There is a charm about this that is not possessed even by money-bags and bank-books, particularly to the lowly and poor. This is a thing

that can be seen, measured, enjoyed, that cannot be taken by burglars, and that imparts a peculiar dignity to the household. Tenantry is almost entirely destitute of this wholesome influence. We, therefore, do not wish to countenance it in any form. Every one of intelligence knows what an unmitigated curse it has proved under existing arrangements, and there is no sufficient reason for supposing that the evil would be materially lessened were Mr. George's plan put in force. Away with it! There is no disguise it can assume, and no plea that can be offered in its defense, that ought to induce us to spare it for a moment. We cry, "Down with tenantry and landlordism!" There is no promise of equality anywhere near them; but only the sad prospect of woe and wretchedness such as to-day fill Ireland and Scotland with unrest and fierce mutterings of coming storms. The government, after all that can be said about it, is only a company of men acting under forms of law, and the law is usually no more to them than it is to the average citizen. They evade it, violate it, and are generally as human as any one else. They would not, therefore, make any better landlords than private parties do to-day, and having extraordinary powers in their hands might make worse. If it shall be said that they would be elected to office, and that in this way there would be a check on them, we have only to remark that the insane land legislation of the past twenty years, and the numerous instances of corruption, have occurred under our elective government; and further, that rulers like Napoleon III. have been chosen by popular suffrage, and that in none of these cases have we the least evidence that responsibility to the people prevents those in high positions from being blunderers, rascals or tyrants.

In aiming to place within the reach of every one a home to be held on the now recognized basis of owner-

ship, it is important that every tendency toward the creation of vast estates should be arrested. Possibly a candid consideration of their ultimate effect on Society, and on their own value as well, may serve to restrain those whose greed seems almost boundless. It is well known that they were disastrous in their influence on the fortunes of imperial Rome. They were then called "*latifundia*"; and Pliny's words, "*latifundia perdidere Italiam*," have a melancholy significance. The Gracchi faithfully tried to have State lands reclaimed and distributed among the proletariat, but they failed; and their obstinate attachment to the populace at last proved fatal to themselves. The reform of Julius Cæsar along the same line, though successful to some extent, was too late to counteract the evil it was designed to remedy. Enormous possessions had rooted out the class of small farmers, whose interest in the soil had given them an interest in the country, and who could generally be relied on in times of national peril. They could not compete with patricians, and they either sold, or were driven out of, their little holdings. With their displacement, while large revenues were at first derived from consolidated estates, slaves and hirelings became their successors, and under their enforced and slovenly tillage the productive power of the land declined. Moreover, their masters, with the increase of acreage, became selfish, dissolute, arrogant and unpatriotic. Their prodigality impoverished them, and as the only order of men who could have reclaimed the comparative unproductive property had been ruined, or had themselves outgrown all taste for agricultural pursuits, and as neither one nor the other had either loyalty or courage left, the government succumbed before the vigorous blows of the barbarian. Such is history. It will repeat itself; and there are signs that it may do so sooner than we expect. The individuals or corporations in Europe and America

that have accumulated mile upon mile of land have apparently wonderfully prospered. They have ruined, or are ruining, their small competitors, and seem to have everything their own way. But what of the results? Let us see. They are helping to recruit the ranks of Socialism, and the growth of that army, with its war-cry of "share and share alike," means the depreciation in value of reality. Driven to desperation by the greed of monopoly, the men who have loved their country because they felt that it was *their* country, will likely speedily learn to join forces with those who would render monopoly impossible by annulling the right of private property entirely. How much think you will "bonanza farms" be worth if the policy of Communism is ever agitated at the polls? But, in addition to this, territorial concentration is impoverishing a multitude whose embarrassments beggar other multitudes, so that the ability of the home market to buy the produce of the fields is declining while the demands of the foreign markets are not increasing. A little more of this grasping, and the profits on crops will be so slight that they will hardly pay to cultivate, and the soil will become a burden to the owner. They will never fail to remunerate the small farmer who grows them for his own consumption, and for the ordinary purposes of traffic; but when they are raised under the conditions we have described, then the purchasers will be limited, or, as all must have food, the price they can command will hardly compensate for the capital invested. One of the evidences that the extensive domains of our times will be broken up, or will in the long run fall to pieces, comes from Scotland. A Mr. T. Purves, a capable farmer, and no friend to Crofters, informed a certain Commission "that the present holdings are unreasonably large, that the farmers don't get half the use of the land they occupy, and that there should be farms from £10 up

to £50 or £100." Similiar testimony comes from France. M. Alfred de Foville in his recent volume, *Le Morcellement*, argues in favor of subdivision, and states that the smaller farms have improved most, have yielded most produce, and have even—although Balzac predicted otherwise—multiplied the horses and cattle of the French nation. In this view of the case M. Henri Baudrillart concurs, and in his new book, *Les Populations Agricoles de la France*, gives a cheering account of the small peasant owners of Normandy and Brittany. Then, what is equally significant, Mr. Arthur Arnold, *Contemporary Review*, declares that the price of land, collected as it is in immense bodies, in Great Britian is declining, though Mr. George thinks that it is the one thing ever appreciating. The same decline will surely be experienced in America, although it may be postponed for some years; but the question is, when it does come will the people have the means to purchase, or will they have any inclination left to till the soil? In England, according of Mr. Arnold, many of the great estates are heavily mortgaged. The figures he gives are: capital invested, £2,000,000,000; incumbrance, some £400,000,000, and the interest on the indebtedness about £18,000,000 per annum. Here we have indications of momentous changes. Luxury, dissipation and wild extravagance will inevitably precipitate a crisis, foreclosures will follow, and princely heritages will be knocked down at auction to the highest bidder. The hope is that when the crash comes the common people will be the buyers; for it is claimed that the mortgages are largely held by bankers who have loaned on these securities the money of artisans, who have entrusted their earnings to the saving institutions they represent. It may be so. But whether it is or not, these facts point to one issue, namely, the division and subdivision of these vast properties, which have been accumulated at so great a cost, not merely of

money, but of human suffering and degradation as well. They cannot be perpetuated: why, then go on adding acre to acre when continued coherence is impracticable, and especially as the process is seriously injuring the agricultural community, and is entailing misfortunes on the age from which it will be exceedingly difficult to recover?

But while we believe this result to be unavoidable, it may be slow in developing, particularly in America; and for this reason we would like to see some simple reforms that might act as a restraint or as a corrective. For instance, Congress should cease making land grants to corporations, should rescind those already made where the conditions have not been complied with, and should do all in its power to carry out the provisions of the homestead law. Moreover, a tax should be imposed on all lands exceeding a certain acreage relatively higher than is imposed on a smaller acreage; and as supplementing this measure, enactments, as recommended in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, should prevent the descent of these dangerous possessions intact from one generation to another. We think it would be well to decree that at least the tenth part of every estate amounting to 5,000 acres and over should return to the State for the use of the people. As the widow has a portion determined by statute so ought the country to have; and the portion inherited by the country could be sold at its market value to any person able to buy, and the proceeds be used in providing places in the far west at nominal sums for the yet poorer classes. This provision would preclude the possibility of the national territory ever being permanently monopolized, would always furnish a fresh supply of lands to meet the requirements of the homestead law, and would constantly remind the prosperous citizen that he is under obligation to work for the common weal as well as for his family. Then, in addition to this, we would have it

enacted that no one person should be permitted to inherit over and above a definite amount of land, say three thousand acres; and that fortunes in money should be broken up and distributed in a similar way. Such an arrangement would not be unjust. It would not deprive the rich man of anything he could legitimately call his own, nor would it diminish the stimulus to endeavor; for as long as he lived he could use his wealth as he pleased; but it would determine for him in some degree what disposition of his property after his death would best serve the highest interests of Society.

Other remedies may probably be devised by Congress, but even these we are persuaded would be exceedingly beneficial. The measures we have specified would tend to preserve the populaton from the blight of tenantry; would not deprive anyone who desired to till the ground of the sweet, stimulating sense of ownership; would, in connection with intelligence, temperance and industrious habits, contribute toward the improvement of agriculture; would prevent the continuance of "bonanza farms," and would fill the unpeopled west with homes instead of abandoning sections of territory embracing more than fifty square miles each, where rarely a woman or a child can be found at present, to mere food-manufacturing; and combined with the spirit of "mutualism," underlying Socialism, would diminish poverty, inspire hope and would in the course of time realize far more true equality than our poor world has ever known.

It may be replied that in answering Mr. George we failed to note any marked abatement of social inequalities where lands are held communally, or where they are subdivided into small properties. True; and we pointed out this fact to show that his scheme would not necessarily and by itself effect the marvellous changes he so confidently predicts; for, as we have claimed the well-being of tenants

is determined as much by themselves, or almost as much, as it is by their landlords, whoever they may be. Were legislation to divide the public domain, and rent to each applicant a holding, equality and happiness would not infallibly ensue. Such legislation might on the whole be favorable to these blessings, but their complete attainment would depend on the character of the citizen. In France and Belgium the very general division of the land is of itself advantageous, but ignorance and political abuses explain why it is not turned to better account. It is the fault of Mr. George that he attributes to external conditions what very largely is the direct result of moral and intellectual qualities. He is altogether too dogmatic in his assertions. Had he argued that an enlightened, energetic people would probably change our civilization for the better if they had freer and fuller possession of the soil than they have in England and America, we would have acknowledged the soundness of the hope; but when he lays such stress on mere communal ownership as he does, we are warranted in citing the example of France or Russia to disprove his assumption; nor are we unprepared to meet the logic of our own position. Were our recommendations carried out an immense improvement in surroundings would be gained; but apart from genuine manhood at the heart of the nation the opportunity thus afforded would be lost to a very great extent. We admit the value of favorable circumstances—none more so than ourselves. The evidence that we appreciate them is supplied by the nature of those we have advocated; and we submit whether they are not more promising than those we have criticised. They would stimulate industrious habits by the expectation of earning a homestead. The people feeling, also, that all they have toiled for is really their own, not to be alienated from them, and not to be superintended by impertinent officials, would experience a sense of personal independence

which would go very far toward developing the vigorous intelligence and energy needful for the judicious improvement of their opportunities. Therefore, while neither Mr. George's theory nor our own would yield any remarkable benefits unless rendered effective by sterling qualities of mind and soul, yet, as ours encourages in some degree a stalwart and self-reliant type of character, we must be allowed to commend it to public consideration and confidence; and as it harmonizes with the genius of the American government, which, as we have shown, is remote from paternalism, we feel that it ought to be received with satisfaction and hope.

Not unlikely the discussion of these so-called remedies has created the suspicion that perfect equality is impossible. This seems to be the impression which the Russian Socialist, Herzen, sought to convey in his last letter to the father of Nihilism, Bakounine, when he used these words: "If even the *bourgeois* world were to be blown up, after the smoke had disappeared and the ashes been swept away, a new but still a *bourgeois* one would reappear." Evidently he could not conceive of Society where the class he refers to, in contradistinction to others, would have no existence. If such an author as Herzen takes this position, there must be overwhelming reasons for believing with Browning, that we cannot tread mankind

> Into a paste, and thereof make a smooth
> Uniform mound whereon to plant your flag,
> The lily-white, above the blood and brains.

We agree with the agitator and the poet; and we are persuaded that a little reflection will satisfy every candid mind that some of the distinctions which continually assert themselves are not wholly without advantage to the race.

It seems evident that social inequality at the beginning

must have arisen from some other kind of inequality. At the dawning of time and in the morning haze of history we discover gigantic personages exercising lordship over the many, and receiving from them tribute in goods and labor. They are head men, chiefs, kings and leaders, but whatever their title they tower above others; they are better fed, better clothed, better housed, and better served. Next to them we find subordinate orders, varying evidently in degree of rank, and yet far removed from the great body of the people. In accounting for these primitive differences it will not do to assume that they grew out of personal property in land, for in many instances such ownership had no existence; and neither will it do to assert that they orignated in violent usurpations of power for that merely asserts what may be a fact, but does not explain how one or a few succeeded in such usurpations at the expense of the multitude. We must look back of these inadequate solutions of the problem to the actors themselves; and we shall see that they secured the homage of their fellows through superior wisdom, cunning, energy, courage, skill or strength. They were greater in some or all of these respects than the throngs around them, and so were able to convince their judgment, appeal to their fears, dazzle their imagination and overcome their scruples. That is, at the first, social inequalities sprang from the variations of human nature; for it was as true then as it is now that no two men are alike, and that each soul which comes into the world, while having features in common with all other souls, is essentially new and alone, never having had its exact counterpart and never to be followed by a complete parallel. Every soul is an original, and we can neither measure its forces by what we know of others, nor clearly foresee the steps of its career by the light of previous lives. There is a large element of mystery and uncertainty connected

with every new-born spirit. If this is so, and if, as sixty centuries of history seem to teach, Society is the counterpart of man's image, the outward being the creation and expression of the inward, then it necessarily follows that the inequalities of the one are directly due to the inequalities of the other, and cannot be evaded.

In addition to this it should be remembered that social inequality is often reversed and counterbalanced by other inequalities. It is not fixed and permanent, not uninterrupted in its succession, and not confined indefinitely to any one class of people. The affluent of today were not the affluent of yesterday, and the affluent of tomorrow will not be the affluent of today. Fortunes are continually changing hands; "upper tens" are constantly called on to give place to new "upper tens," and the summits become the valleys and the valleys the summits. Society is very much like the ocean, where there is a constant rise and fall, and where the drops of water which at one moment make the crest of the wave, at the next form the trough of the sea. Many families of nobility in England are only old in name. Most of them are of modern origin, and are the outgrowth of successful business enterprise. The large majority of the rich among ourselves created their own fortunes; and no small number of the men who are leaders in statesmanship, in literature and finance are indebted to their own energy and skill for their success. From this it would seem that there is a constant shifting of possessions and privileges; that no section of the race can claim their constant monopoly; that no other section is irrevocably deprived of their enjoyment, and that their attainment and retainment are determined by forces that are native to the soul or which have been developed in it. You desire to perpetuate your fortune to your descendants, and you may succeed in doing so for a generation or two; but, unless you can perpetuate your ability as well, the

time will assuredly arrive when a stronger man will rise and enter into the house of your children's children and despoil them of their goods. Thus there is flux and reflux, changes inevitable and changes perpetual; and this fact should teach the high the lesson of modesty, and the lowly the lesson of hope; and should convince both that no omnipotent fatality governs their destiny, ordaining one to undeserved elevation and dooming the other to unmerited degradation,

Moreover it should be observed that social inequalities are not without relief and compensation in some other kinds of inequality. Man's position or surroundings does not determine his happiness or misery. "Uneasy is the head that wears a crown," and uneasy is the heart of him who possesses $73,000,000. He is not only assailed by the impecunious and the desperate, but he is in constant apprehension from the plots and the wiles of his sworn enemies, who are anxious to relieve him of his superfluous wealth. Your Vanderbilts and Goulds are not necessarily happy, and neither are your mechanics and laborers necessarily wretched. All elevations are not fertile, for mountains there are which are bleak, cold, desolate; and all depressions are not barren, for valleys there are, attractive, warm and fruitful. Yea, of the two we naturally look for more abundant increase from the vales than from the hills, and we cannot but feel that honest poverty will know more of peace, content and blissful calm than affluence. You may have been told, or you may yourselves have noticed, that the physical inequalities of the globe are necessary to its habitableness; and you may not be blind to the fact that social inequalities have ministered to the progress of the ages. Here we have another compensation which we cannot afford to overlook. Mr. Mallock argues that the desire to be superior to others is the source of endeavors to excel in art, science and commerce. If it were not possible to

realize this desire it would soon entirely cease; and, if it ceased, progress would be indefinitely interrupted. But the possibility of realizing it, of being elevated above our fellows, implies a social condition where there are class distinctions, where there is an upper and a lower, and where a man can rise from the one state to the other. Inequality is therefore necessary to inspire and reward effort; and the fruits of effort in the direction of inventions, discoveries, reforms, react upon the more dependent classes, and bring blessings to them in lightening the burdens of labor and in diminishing its cares, and thus compensate them for many of the evils which are inseparable from their lot.

From these reflections we may learn that we cannot entirely destroy social inequalities, even if we would. Their real foundation is not property, but humanity. To abrogate them we must abrogate man, and that is plainly impossible. Also, we may believe as they minister to progress, that we cannot afford to dispense with them altogether. But how if they are to be regarded as permanent, can they be sufficiently diminished or modified so as to increase the total sum of earthly happiness?

This is the real question at issue. In part we have furnished an answer to it in what we have said on the subject of Socialism and of State Landlordism. Cultivate the spirit of mutualism, and the genuine reciprocity which will follow cannot fail to break down barriers that now separate one portion of the community from the other; and place modest homes and farms within the reach of the people, and extremes of destitution and despair will at least be much rarer than they are at present. But, in addition to this, we must not overlook the truth that if we equalize man as man we equalize Society. There are distinctions that separate individuals, such as genius, natural aptitudes and endowments, which can in part be

developed and which must be regarded as contributing to the advancement of the race. Then there is ignorance, passion, appetite, selfishness, cruelty, which differentiate men, and out of which spring oppressions and every species of wrong doing. Let these qualifications and these vicious tendencies be dealt with vigorously and fairly; let the former be recognized and cultivated, and let the latter be repressed and subdued, and a hopeful change will be immediate and apparent. In a word, educate—educate head and heart—educate thoroughly, radically, completely, mentally, religiously, and with the demands of the age full in view, and the ax will be laid at the very root of the worst types of inequality. Do not be afraid of uniformity and monotony arising from such education; for, after we have done all in our power to unify humanity, diversity enough will exist for all practical purposes. Educate thus comprehensively the people and they will be less dependent upon employers, less willing to submit to outrage, and less liable to be imposed on; they will be more capable of attending to their own affairs, of inaugurating reforms in the administration of public justice, and of defending their own rights from tyranny; and they will be better fitted to care for their earnings, to invest them judiciously and to save them from the vortex of dissipation. Educate them in this manner, and they will command the respect of all in authority, and they will create a sentiment which will compel the impartial administration of the law. Surely, to attain these ends is to render social inequalities more and more inappreciable. If it does not destroy them—and in some sense they are indestructible—it does what is just as good, and perhaps better, it renovates them. And when they are thus renovated, and survive only in an inoffensive form, and in a way indispensable to progress, then we shall substantially have achieved the object for which philanthropists and

Christians have labored in vain so long. Of the character of this education and of its agents we shall speak in a subsequent paper; but it ought to be said that the doctrine here avowed is the doctrine of the Bible. The Savior teaches it when He declares the quality of fruitage to depend on the quality of the tree, and when He lays such stress as He does on the renewal of the soul, He does not devote His attention to surface measures of reform, but to a new heart, confident that the regeneration of man means the regeneration of civilization. The method of our Lord at this point differs radically from human schemes. They attach undue and almost exclusive importance to right circumstances, He almost exclusively to right principles and right springs of action.

Intimately related to education, and growing out of it, self-government would materially diminish the distress of those who suffer most from present economical arrangements. If anything can be done to improve the condition of the hard-worked poor by themselves, it is only right that they should undertake it. Probably it will be said that they attempt much, that they attend Socialistic meetings, Trades-Union gatherings, seek to influence candidates for office, and make up crowds that hurrah for strikers. Well, what then? We know they do this; but in our opinion they all the while pass a simple remedy which lies at their door—self-control—which if duly appreciated would relieve them from many of the miseries which now darken their lives. If they would only save what they actually waste in stupid excesses, the extremes which now horrify us would be less perceptible and less real. As we shall have to refer to this subject again in another connection, we shall only here quote a few figures relative to the consumption of intoxicants and tobacco in Great Britain, which, however, can be paralleled in

this country. According to the most reliable estimates, the expenditure of the British working classes in drinking and smoking is not far from £60,000,000, of which, admitting that stimulants are needful, £40,000,000 is mere extravagant folly. This has been called "self-imposed taxation," and it amounts to sufficient, if wisely cared for, to render the greater portion of the population independent of employers, to revolutionize in a few years the position of labor, and to purchase homes, and to build mills and factories for those who can have no hope of owning anything so long as they fritter away their substance in convivial living. These mechanics and toilers earn, according to Mr. Greg and Mr. Baxter, an aggregate income of £300,000,000 per annum, of which they literally throw away £40,000,000, enough to make the difference between comfort and discomfort, abundance and poverty, decency and indecency. After this what must we think of the good judgment or integrity of those who wish to confiscate the capital or lands of others? If so much is squandered of what is earned with many hardships, what would become of the portions assigned without toil and without price? It is to be feared that, like the prodigal, they would waste their substance in riotous living. They certainly are not to be trusted with more, especially with what costs them nothing, until they are more soberly economical in the expenditure of what they have received in return for sweat of brow and for exhausting endeavors. When so slight a sacrifice would materially benefit them, and they do not feel sufficient interest in themselves and their families to make it, we ought not to be surprised that many persons kindly disposed toward them should lose their solicitude for their welfare, and should even abandon in despair legislative remedies proposed on their behalf. They might arrest this awful drain on their resources by their own motion,

by an act of intelligent, resolute, persistent volition, without revolutionizing Society, without aid from government, and without diverging from the American *laissez faire* principle. And if they would only do this, many of the problems now harrassing the statesman and the philanthropist would be a long way on the road toward solution, and before three generations had passed the artisan classes would be educated, and they would be pleasantly housed, and above all, they would be capitalists themselves and would exert a decisive influence on the debate between capital and labor. But if they are not willing to do this much that their condition may be brightened, and that the distance between them and their neighbors may be lessened, we surely must doubt whether any outside interference, private or official, could be successful in suppressing the much complained of inequalities.

There is another measure by which the end sought, and which it is the object of this paper to promote, may be in some good degree attained. We refer to coöperation, which has been defined by its foremost exponent, George Jacob Holyoake, as "a new force in industry, which obtains competency without mendicancy, and gives equal rewards by equalizing fortunes." When lecturing in New York he added this further explanation for the benefit of our general public who are not well informed on the subject:

> Coöperation is often likened to two hounds who unite in catching hares, and thus secure more than they could separately. There is this difference between coöperation and hare hunting: The hounds catch the hares for the hunter; we catch the hares with the intention of eating them ourselves. Coöperation means this: A number of persons join together for the purpose, by acts of economy, concert and good will, of obtaining certain advantages, and of dividing the results among themselves, each taking a share proportionate to the industry and capital he has applied in helping out the scheme. There are three ways in which coöperation is applied—by stores, by

workshops and by banks. In France they excel in coöperation in the workshop; in Germany in the bank, and in England in the store, while in America they excel in none of the three. You are too rich to care about humble gain, and you are so well informed that it is impossible to add to your stock of social information.

This sarcastic allusion to our self-sufficiency may not be undeserved; but that we may no longer be guilty of neglecting a means which has been tested with advantage elsewhere, let us familiarize ourselves somewhat with its character and workings.

An unknown writer in the *London Quarterly Review* relates a conversation he had with a member of the Parisian Commune, who spoke of the aims and inspiration of its leaders in the following terms:

> The artisans and poorer classes of France—*i. e.*, of Paris and the great towns are ground down (*exploité*) by the capitalists, their employers; they wish to reap the fruits of their own labor; they wish, in fact, to work for their own benefit and not for that of others; they think that all capital ought to belong to the State, and be lent out on moderate interest to associations of operatives, who would thus enter into the full enjoyment of the products of their own industry. They believe that only a republic, of which the working classes should be the directors, would give them this result; and they know that a republic of this sort can only be established by a revolution, and therefore they are willing to hazard everything and upset everything in the cause of such a revolution.

But all this can be accomplished without troubling and burdening the State, without overthrowing administrations, or engaging in sanguinary strife. Any body of workmen who can lay by money and club together, or can obtain credit, may start in business for themselves, and it is surely not worth while to upset the ruling powers for the sake of trying a similar experiment on a larger scale, and with many perils threatening failure in the way. While it is substantially the same in principle with the Communist's plan, we believe that coöperation, voluntary

and private, is infinitely of more value to the nation. Wherever these partnerships are successful they do good in various ways. They teach and train the working classes in the management of business, impart ideas of its difficulties and its drawbacks. Moreover, they promote forethought in the operative, and generally add to his income; for by becoming employer and virtually capitalist he reaps a fair share of the capitalist's gain. Now there is no reason why these partnerships should not become common. If English workmen would only moderate their drink and tobacco bills, in a few years they could save £500 each, and ten of them combining would have £5,000 capital, and they would have another £5,000 in credit due to their character, that is, to their temperance and frugality. And all this is as possible to the American as to the Englishman. Neither is there any reason why workmen, as their education improves and their habits mend, as they learn to govern themselves and to confide in each other, should not combine for the majority of industrial occupations without a master, and in fact, be their own employers and select their own overseers. Mr. Lyman Abbott in the *Century* has a right to reprove the mechanics and laborers of our country for their reluctance to thus unite together for business and profit, while they are ready to combine for every other conceivable purpose, especially to strike for higher wages. And we perhaps cannot do better than to quote his own earnest words, which show how through coöperation all may be helped. He says:

> You combine only that you may not work. In one summer's telegraphic strike you spent $400,000 for the right to be idle. Why did you not expend it for the right to be independent? Half a million dollars, plus all the best telegraphic talent in the United States, with the sympathies of the nation as a reserve, combined to establish postal telegraphy, might have given you success instead of failure. Strike, not for better wages in servitude, but for independence. Organize, not to be idle, but to be busy. Combine not against your

employers, but that you may employ yourselves. You battle not for the rights of labor, but for the right not to labor; it is a barren, fruitless right, not worth fighting for. Victory is as bad as defeat. For combination put coöperation; for few hours and fair wages put independence; for a right to be idle put power to work. Make yourselves capitalists, combine your capital with your industry, and add to it by your credit, and so become your own masters.

Very few of the toiling masses ever reflect on these things, very few know their own power, or regard such suggestions as practicable. Yet they are; they have been tried over and over again with success, and they only need a general and earnest adoption for a silent, bloodless revolution to be wrought, and for all classes to be brought together in closer relations and on more friendly terms, than are common today.

Something of the process and promise of these associations Mr. Holyoake has presented, and it may be well to confirm our hopes by what he has written. His words are:

Coöperation means that many persons contribute separately and individually to one end and that end is the creation of new capital, which each person contributing shall share. All are in earnest; all do their best; each one works, and each one carries away his full share of the profits. Coöperation makes profit by economy.

In forming a coöperative store in England a few persons assemble and explain to those who don't know it already that it is desirable for them to band together to secure purity of the goods which they buy, fairness in weighing and measuring, avoidance of anxiety about being poisoned or cheated, and the creation of new capital. They each contribute a small amount of money to start the store, it being desirable to start in a small way at first and with as many subscribers as possible. None of the money is begged or borrowed or received as a gift. A small, cheap place is taken, and service is voluntary in the new store at first. The subscribers find that the more they trade at the store the greater are the profits, so they all become propagandists to get new purchasers and subscribers. There is therefore no need of expense for advertising. The average profits are ten per cent. Of this, five per cent is given to the purchasers according to the amount each one purchases. A part of the profit is set aside for rent, another part for a rainy day, and two and a half per cent for an educational

fund for the members of the association. In Leeds the Association has 18,000 buyers, in Halifax 12,000, and in Rochdale still more. In Rochdale the store makes a profit of £50,000 a year. It would be considered a grand and noble deed if a rich man should give to the workingmen of a city $250,000 a year. But is it not nobler and grander for the workingmen to give to themselves? In Manchester the store gave its members a profit of £21,000 and set aside £300 for persons who were not members, £600 for education, £600 for the servants of the association, £400 for a reserve fund, and sums ranging from five to ten guineas for different charitable purposes.

These figures are inspiring, and fully bear out the expectations we have expressed. And though the coöperative system in America has not been as prominent as in England, and has likewise suffered from incompetence and even dishonesty, its record is far from discouraging. We hear of a New Bedford store of this kind making in 1849 a total sale of $31,279.64, which compares very favorably with some English houses. There were several coöperative divisions in New England in 1851, and they sold in that year $619,633.16; and in 1852 one hundred and sixty-five divisions received from purchasers $1,696,825.46. The profits from the Natick store are about $3.60 on every $10 share, a proof that investments in such establishments yield a large dividend. The president of the National Council, speaking in Syracuse, March, 1877, said:

> Ninety-four (94) councils, selected from the whole, report a membership of 7,273, and with an average capital of only $884, did a business last year of $1,089,372.55. This was equal to a saving of $21 to every man and woman belonging to these councils. It is safe to assume that the unreported sales will swell the amount to at least $3,000,000, which, at the same ratio of profit as above reported, would make a saving of $420,000.

So, also, the Raritan Woolen Mills Coöperative Association sold in 1880, $95,821.39 of goods, and returned a large profit to the shareholders. These instances and many more that could be cited prove Mr. Barnard to be

in the wrong when he asserts that "in this country distributive coöperation has been marked by almost utter failure." This is not the case, though we admit it has not been as successful as it should have been. The mind of the people has been so frequently distracted by political remedies, remedies requiring no particular sacrifice of ease and no special exercise of thought, that it has never vigorously grasped the coöperative method, and never fully realized that it can do all that government can, and that, too, without intrenching on the independence of the citizen. Today we believe that a change is taking place in the public estimation of this subject. We sincerely trust it may continue. If it shall, and if we can be persuaded generally to employ this "new industrial force," as Holyoake calls it, then the wretched extremes of want and despair will gradually disappear, and something more like brotherhood in fortune and in hope prevail.

This would indeed be a great step in advance, but if not supplemented by another it would undoubtedly fail in being as permanently beneficial as it should and might be. That which is needful to carry forward what it inaugurates is absolute equality of all persons before the bar of justice. We have protested against discriminating legislation, so do we now express our condemnation of discriminations in the execution of law. Let every man be judged on his intrinsic merits, not by his extrinsic value. Justice ought to have her eyes bandaged so that she cannot see the clothes or purse of the accused. We may be told that the bandage has not been removed; but though this may be the case, we fear she can see under the handkerchief that is over her eyes, especially when bloated affluence bustles into the criminal dock. She has quick discernment, and knows a beggar from a moneylord in a moment. The former is ever made to feel that he is an intruder, that he has no right in court, and that

uncomplainingly, if not with gratitude, he ought to submit to be snubbed by his honor, to be browbeaten by the attorney, and to be clubbed or kicked by the policemen. He is made to feel that the entire machinery and paraphernalia of justice are opposed to him, and that, however, he may have been wronged, he has nothing to expect from them, and if not careful has everything to fear. Many, therefore, oppressed by business tyrants, feel that they dare not take an appeal to where sits enthroned the majesty of law. Reforms are demanded in the administration of this same law, so that it may be less sordid and more useful, less formal and more sympathetic, less aristocratic and more popular. In olden times the suffering poor could arrest the royal progress and obtain a hearing; but if a sewing-girl, plundered of her wages, seeks protection today she will very likely be fined for disturbing the court or be sent to bridewell. The fact is, the indigent defrauded man has little if any chance against capital; and the wealthy scoundrel has little to apprehend from the prosecution set in motion by the wretched maiden he has ruined. During the trial of a great many cases the counsel engaged can scarcely refrain from laughing at each other and at the legal farce in which they are playing amusing parts, and over which his honor looks quite droll, while only the spectators wear a somber, semi-tragical air. Surely the scenes ordinarily enacted in police stations and court rooms, and many of the decisions rendered by the bench, do not represent justice as it should be, but rather a horrible burlesque of its dignity and functions. It is now as when Shakespeare wrote—

> In the corrupted currents of this world
> Offense's gilded hand may shove by justice;
> And oft 'tis seen, the wicked prize itself
> Buys out the law. * * *
> Plate sin with gold,

> And the strong lance of justice hurtless breaks.
> Arm it in rags, a pigmy's straw doth pierce it.

And if it is, the entire nation should rise in its might and demand correction, alteration and amendment; the vindication of right, however lowly, and the condemnation of wrong, however haughty. Many legal gentlemen have seen with perfect distinctness the pressing need that exists for a thorough revision of the Code, especially for its simplification, and for improvements in methods of administration. They know as well as we do that we are cumbered with superfluous statutes, endless precedents, bewildering complications, and tedious circumlocutions that render litigation not only appallingly expensive but amazingly slow. A country like ours ought to be ashamed to tolerate such a state of things. Public men must be familiar with the fact that we are governed by various institutions which date back to the Romans, or to England's darkest period, and that we have never made a sufficient effort to decide on their fitness for our nation, nor have taken adequate pains to sift out from them those things that are vicious and essentially unrepublican. We hold that it is their duty to move in the matter. In their positions of influence they should seek such reforms in the laws and in their equal enforcement that the humblest citizen could feel that his interests are guarded by them, and that he could secure their friendly aid and support, though without a penny to invest his case with a glitter of interest before the courts.

But while the value of a radical change of this general character is commonly acknowledged to be indispensable, and one that ought to be inaugurated by Congress, there is another, a departure quite a novelty in this land, which ought to be studied and then put in operation by the employed and their employers. We refer to what is known in England as the "Boards of Conciliation," and in

France as "*La Conseils de Prud'hommes.*" Concerning the former we have this suggestive statement in the *London Quarterly Review:*

It is not very easy to understand what more can be wanted in the shape of effective representation of the feelings and interests of employed and employers than such an agency as has for some years been supplied by the Boards of Conciliation established in Nottingham, the Staffordshire potteries and Wolverhampton, of the satisfactory working of which full evidence was given to the Trades' Union Commissioners by Mr. Mundella, M. P., Mr. Hollins and Mr. Rupert Kettle. "These Board," say the Commissioners in their final report, "require no complicated machinery, no novel division of profits, no new mode of conducting business; they need no Act of Parliament, no legal powers or penalties. All that is needed is that certain representative employers and workmen should meet at regular stated times and amicably discuss around a table the common interests of their common trade or business. There is not a trade or business in the United Kingdom in which this system might not *at once* be adopted; and we see no reason why, in every case, results should not follow from the establishment of Boards of Conciliation as satisfactory as those at Nottingham and in the potteries to which we have before referred. Under such a system we should look hopefully for a peaceful, prosperous future for the industry of this country."

Since the establishment of these boards the government has been constrained to amend the labor laws by the passing of the Employers' and Workmen's Act, and of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, thus extending unusual help to the most dependent portion of community. In France *The Conseils* are a much more perfect organization, and occupy a far more prominent position before the public. The present law under which they are organized and worked dates from 1853. Where such a council is to be formed a memorial is sent to the Minister of Commerce by the local authorities. The municipality has to bear the cost of establishing, including offices and courts. The outlay for the year is estimated by the president, and is sent to the mayor, and is included in his budget. No one

can hold the office of president unless he has never been convicted of crime, misdemeanors, breaches of trust, or offenses against morality and decency, and unless he is guiltless of commercial frauds, false weights, adulterations, keeping gaming tables and disorderly houses. Each Council is divided into two chambers, called, respectively, the Private and the General office. The former consists of two members, an employer and a workman, and its duty is to conciliate the parties who come before it. In case of failure these parties go before the General Council, composed of an equal number of masters and workmen, five forming a quorum. Always the affair in dispute must be connected with business, and with contracts about which there has been some misunderstanding. Appeals may be taken from this tribunal to the Commercial Court, or if need be, to the Court of Cassation. These appeals are very rare, the contending sides being usually satisfied with the arbitration; and questioning very seriously whether they would gain anything by further agitation, they prefer to submit to the decrees already passed in their case. It is also to be borne in mind that this species of litigation is exceedingly cheap, and is at the service of the poorest. We give a table of fees in English shillings and pence that its moderation in price may be seen:

	s.	*d.*
TO THE SECRETARY OF THE COUNCIL.		
For the letter of invitation to attend	0	3
For each page of copies of papers sent	0	4
For a copy of the minutes certifying non-conciliation	0	8
TO THE USHER OF THE COUNCIL.		
For each citation (void in case the letter of invitation fails to secure attendance)	1	0
For the notification of a judgment	1	5
In case the parties live more than three miles from the court the usher is allowed for each six miles:		
For the citation	1	5
For the notification	1	8

The reader will appreciate this list of prices when he is told that the only fee paid in ordinary cases is the first on the list, threepence, or about six cents and a half. Perhaps, also, a glance at the statistics, which give a fair idea of these courts in operation, may be advisable, if a similar movement should be commenced in America.

From the *Contemporary Review* we gather these figures:

Since the establishment of the system the number of courts has largely increased, there having been 62 in 1844, and at the present time about 132. The cases heard in private sittings have fluctuated during different periods; but on the whole have had a tendency to increase, especially since 1880, in which year the figures were 39,429. Of these 73 per cent were disposed of in 12 manufacturing centers. Paris, with 4 Prud'homme Courts, had 16,757 cases; Lyons, 2,969: St. Etienne, 1,513; Roubaix, 1,414; Havre, 1,303; Bordeaux, 1,060; Lille, 812; Elbœuf, 737; Limoges, 782; Marseilles, 601; St. Quentin, 520; Besancon, 501; the total number of these cases being 28,969. Out of every 100 cases brought before the Court of Conciliation 59 related to wages; 13 to dismissals; 10 to misbehavior; 5 to disputes about apprenticeship, and 13 to various other points. On an average about a fourth of the complaints were withdrawn before hearing

This is what we call an encouraging record. There is surely as much need for such an institution in this country as there is in Europe. Let it be called by whatever name the public may delight in, but let it be in truth an "Arbitration Bureau," where the poor can rehearse their wrongs, and where the rich will be strictly held to their obligations, and where justice can be meted out to all. We rejoice that steps are already being taken in this direction, and we trust, even if President Cleveland's plan is not adopted, that some other will be carefully devised by the representatives of labor and manufacturing organizations, and Arbitration Courts or Committees be established throughout our land. An arrangement of this kind would be conducive to peace and happiness. The number of misunderstandings would decrease if it were known that they would be reviewed; and few employers

would attempt on some pretext to rob workmen and working women were they certain that their meanness would assuredly be published far and wide; and few wage-workers would rush into senseless and expensive strikes if they realized that their recklessness would expose them to prompt arraignment and condemnation. Let us by all means have something like the *Conseils de Prud'hommes.* They would do us all good. They would abate abuses; they would force considerable more humanity into factories and shops and more common sense into the heads of labor reformers than is found there now; they would lead to a more complete understanding between the parties concerned in production; they would tend to much cordial and mutually appreciative interest between thinkers and workers, and would rapidly break down many obnoxious distinctions which now seem to render impracticable anything resembling brotherhood.

On this point nothing more need be said at present. There is, however, another movement which has somewhat grown in public favor of late, concerning which we ought candidly and seriously to think. What we refer to specially is the question of how many hours should constitute a day's lawful work. For instance, at present some street-car conductors are on duty from fourteen to sixteen hours; and many women, to earn enough for a wretched support, have to toil pretty nearly through sixteen and eighteen hours, and it is evident that these people can never rise in the social scale. What opportunity have they for reading or reflection, what for family duties, the care of children and the repair of worn-out clothing? None. They must live as semi-barbarians, bring up their children in the same way and grow bitter, heart-sick and dangerous. Many clerks are taxed beyond their strength, and as we look upon the faded forms of young men and young women behind the counter we cannot

refrain from feeling that we have reached an era when humanity is generally valued less than gold. Were it not so stores would not remain open as frequently as they do at night, and factories would not be run as much as they now are by gaslight. Everywhere complaints are numerous that time is monopolized beyond all reason to coin riches for employers. This protracted service is deleterious. First, it ministers to disease; secondly, it discourages, for it allows no place for self-improvement; and thirdly, it drives thousands to the excessive use of strong drink. This last statement reminds us of an objection that is made to diminished hours of labor. Sometimes it is said that a shorter day of toil leaves multitudes the opportunity of spending more time in saloons than they otherwise would; but such objectors never stop to consider the patent fact that the excessive fatigue and consequent exhaustion from prolonged toil drive more persons to dissipation than a more considerate system would. These overburdened ones, in many instances, feel very much like slaves; they lose their self respect and abandon themselves to reckless courses. It is a surprise to us that street-car companies ever have a sober man in their employment. They are so harsh, so autocratic, so penurious, and are so much more careful of the cattle they use than they are of the men, that we cannot but suspect them of classing all together as animals; and we cannot but wonder that any of these human animals can keep away from the degrading swill troughs of intemperance. Also, it is somehow rarely thought of that the extension of a working day beyond right and reason excludes many persons from the labor market, makes not a few of them paupers, and goes far toward making them loungers and loafers. On the contrary, the eight-hour principle will give employment to a larger number of people than is possible now, will afford them sufficient time to make substantial personal improve-

ment, and will redeem their pursuits from much that is debasing and depressing.

During the agitation of this question in Chicago some curious facts were brought to light and some singular statements made. One man asserted that he had been married three years and had never seen his family by daylight; and another declared that he had to work from 7 o'clock in the morning until 10 at night, and on Sundays until 4 p. m. He added that even then his "boss" was sad when he saw the store about to close. An article also appeared at the time of the discussion in the *Telegram* giving an account of the eight-hour day in Australia, where it went into force in 1855, and where, according to the figures given, it had greatly contributed to the material and moral prosperity of that country. But the clearest and most comprehensive review of the measure was published in the *Forum*, from which monthly we gather the following interesting items: If the eight-hour system were adopted in America there would be a uniform reduction of three hours' labor a day, the effect of which would be to reduce the average daily production over one-fourth. This would be equal to increasing the present demand over one-fourth; that is, it would create employment for 3,500,000 toilers—more laborers than we have disengaged in the United States and in England. Then the new demand for labor would necessarily increase the number of consumers, and thereby still further enlarge the demand for commodities, and according to the popular doctrine of supply and demand, the increased call for labor, by reducing competition among laborers, must tend to increase wages. But the advantage would not wholly be with the artisan class. The change proposed would add to "the extent of the market," and as Adam Smith taught, "the larger the market the lower the price," the manufacturer would maintain his profits by the additional demand

for his goods; and the public would be benefited, for this demand being increased would enable the producer to sell at prices even more moderate than at present. The writer, of whose article we are giving a summary, adds that "the extent of the market" is governed by the normal consumption of wealth in any community, and the consumption of wealth is determined by the general standard of living; and, therefore, whatever tends to increase the wants and improve the habits of the masses must necessarily tend to permanently increase the consumption and production of wealth, and thereby conduce to industrial and social advancement. He quotes Prof. Hearn as saying:

> It depends upon the education, in the widest sense of the term, of each individual, and upon his character as mainly resulting from that education, how many and what kind of objects, and with what persistency he desires. We know that the desires of educated men are more varied and more extended than those of persons without education. We know the wages of educated men are higher, and consequently the means of gratifying their desires greater than those of the uneducated. * * * Those nations and those classes of a nation who stand highest in the scale of civilization are those whose wants, as experience shows us, are the most numerous.

The conclusion from this statement is that as the eight-hour rule would create new environments and afford opportunities for personal improvements, wants would multiply, the standard of living improve, and as a result general prosperity ensue. This conclusion he admirably strengthens by an appeal to those countries where a gradual reduction in the hours of labor has taken place. His facts and figures warrant the inference that wherever this course has been pursued beneficial social changes have followed; and consequently, he recommends that in the United States an effort should be made to diminish the time now devoted to all kinds of business pursuits.

How this can best be brought about will doubtless lead to differences of opinion. For ourselves we have no wish

to invoke the aid of government, and we believe many others besides ourselves would much prefer to see the leading employers take the initiative. It would be a grand thing for them to effect an organization among themselves for the purpose of agreeing that eight hours henceforth shall constitute a day's work. Were they to take this action the smaller manufacturers and masters would be obliged to follow suit; for otherwise they would find no operatives or mechanics willing to serve them. But while we cannot recommend the direct interference of the State in this matter, yet we are fully persuaded that in those instances where women and children, and some men also, are compelled by their employers to labor from thirteen to fifteen hours a day, it ought, both in the name of justice and of the Constitution, to interpose that these helpless ones may be rescued from the unfeeling creatures who seem to think that nerves and muscles are as unsusceptible to pain as the machinery they use is to conscious weariness. Let it not be forgotten that the Constitution declares that Congress shall have power "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Some persons may question the force of the latter cause; but, nevertheless, if the legislation on behalf of sailors may be taken as illustrative of its scope, then there is nothing to prevent our law-makers from correcting by legal enactment the abuse of which we complain. Such a statute would not differ in principle from what was done for the welfare of our mariners. If advantage is continally being taken of the necessities of the labor-classes so that they are being morally and physically injured, and if they are gradually being unfitted to bear the responsibilities of citizens, and relief comes from no other quarter, then the government, on the authority of the Constitutional provision referred to, ought to interfere. It has no right to permit what is, or will be, virtually a

slave caste developed by overreaching greed beneath the very shadow of our free institutions. There is no sort of Socialistic taint in the recommendation we make. We are not advising that Congress shall determine what profession any one shall follow, or shall undertake to manage the business of the country: but simply that it shall proceed to take such steps as shall prevent the possibity of a repetition in this land of the Venetian Republic's decline and fall. An Oligarchy ruled and ruined Venice. It will prove disastrous wherever it is fostered. Far more is it to be dreaded than a Monarchy, and of all Oligarchies that of money is the most soulless and despicable. Our government is as much bound to stay its insidious approaches as it is to guard against schemes and plots of any ambitious demagogue who might take a serious fancy to establish here a throne and make himself a king. Short work would be made of such an aspirant for regal honors. The authorities, though they might smile at his pretensions, would not for a moment allow him to enforce them. So, observing the deteriorating effect of excessive hours of labor, and discerning how they favor the formation of a privileged order, which on account of its immense resources becomes a menace to the well-being of these States, they ought to be equally prompt to avert the peril.

In future discussions much will be found bearing directly on this subject; and for the present, therefore, we may leave it and the entire theme on which we have written so much. We would in closing this paper urge upon its readers to ponder the recommendations we have made; and we do so by one of the sublimest of all truths which touch the race—namely, man's equality; for, while in one sense he is unequal, in another he is not. We differ from each other in ability and gifts, in strength of mind and body, but not in nature. In all essentials we are constituted alike. We have similar feelings,

sympathies, emotions, hopes and fears. We all stand on an equal footing of privilege before God, of hope before the cross, and of rewards before the throne. Yea, we have far more in common than we usually think. We are born alike, we suffer alike, we sleep alike, we die and lie in the ground alike. Referring to death reminds us of a remark made by M. Demogest, the historian, when commenting on an old cloister chronicle. He says, the year of grace 732, in which Charles Martel succeeded at the battle of Poictiers, and arrested the vast invasion of Islamism, was not vouchsafed a place on certain cloister records. But near to a particular date we have the statement "*Martin est mort,*" Martin being an undistinguished monk of the Abbey of Corvey. Some time after we meet another insertion: "*Charles, maire du palais, est mort;*" and this was all the chroniclers had to say concerning the "Iron Hammer" who had broken to pieces the foes of Christianity. Well does Demogest moralize, "*tous les hommes deviennent egaux devant la secheresse laconique de ces premier chroniqueurs.*" Laconic enough, and grim enough, God knows! Moreover, as death is common, so is it also remarkable how many points of agreement there are between lives most widely separated by differences of fortune. Equality lies at the heart of inequality, forcing us to think of our brotherhood, and compelling us to note the stupidity as well as rascality involved in all overreaching schemes. Pathetically, indeed, has James Montgomery presented this thought, and his verse may render it far more vivid than anything we could say:

Once in the flight of ages past
  There lived a man: and who was he?
Mortal! howe'er thy lot be cast,
  That man resembled thee.
* * * * *
He suffered,—but his pangs are o'er;
  Enjoy'd,—but his delights are fled;

Had friends,—his friends are now no more:
And foes,—his foes are dead.

* * * * *

He saw whatever thou hast seen;
Encounter'd all that troubles thee;
He was—whatever thou hast been;
He is—what thou shalt be.

* * * * *

The annals of the human race,
Their ruins, since the world began,
Of him afford no other trace
Than this,—THERE LIVED A MAN!

And yet unless our times are reformed it will hardly be possible to record of millions, "There *lived* a man." It may be truthfully said, "there *starved* a man," or that many sought to live, but were not allowed to do so by greed and insatiable avarice. But be this as it may. However natural the criticism, there is a substantial truth in Montgomery's lines which cannot be evaded. We are more alike, feel more alike, and are more indissolubly allied to each other than we are always prepared to acknowledge. Now by this unity, by this fellowship, by this brotherhood, we are appealed to in the sacred Scriptures to help our fellows into the higher, the grandest, the truest life—to so lift them up in themselves that they may be lifted up above the evils of Society and be made free of them forever. This motive should influence us. It should constrain us, as far as in us lies, to take up this work and devote ourselves to its glorious completion. We can only hope that it may. We can only pray that it may incline us to hear the call for help that comes to us from suffering thousands, and may inspire us with an unswerving purpose and unflinching courage to press forward to the rescue.

IV.

THE SUFFERINGS OF SOCIETY.

I gazed on power till I grew blind—
On power; I could not take my eyes from that—
That only, I thought, should be preserved, increased,
At any risk, displayed, struck out at once—
The sign, and note, and character of man.
I saw no use in the past: only a scene
Of degradation, imbecility—
The record of disgraces best forgotten,
A sullen page in human chronicles
Fit to erase. * * *
What wonder if I saw no way to shun despair!
* * * And more bitter,
To fear a deeper curse, an inner ruin—
Plague beneath plague—the last turning the first
To light beside the darkness. Better weep
My youth and its brave hopes, all dead and gone,
In tears which burn!

* * * * * * *

Meanwhile, if I stoop
Into a dark, tremendous sea of cloud,
It is but for a time: I press God's lamp
Close to my breast—its splendor, soon or late,
Will pierce the gloom: I shall emerge one day!
You understand me? I have said enough?

—*Robert Browning.*

ALL suffering is not due to the blunders and crimes of Society. Whatever philosophers may say to the contrary, it is sadly evident that, apart from civilization, and indeed wherever "the vast, unbroken circle" of the sky extends, from the "pale-peaked hill" to the "last

verge of ocean," the monotonous wail of human sorrow breaks upon the ear.

It is true that in the centers of commerce it is painfully distinct, and that Mrs. Browning has reason to chant her joyless song:

> I dwell amid the city
> And hear the flow of souls in act and speech,
> For pomp or trade, for merrymake or folly:
> I hear the confluence and sum of each,
> And that is melancholy!
> Thy voice is a complaint, O crownéd city!
> The blue sky covering thee like God's great pity!

But even in a state of nature this melancholy sound is not unknown. The freest and wildest savage, whose neck has never bent to the yoke of toil, has his cares and disappointments, as truly as the man who has never breathed the fragrance of summer fields or never known release from the muddy, smoky streets of sweltering towns. While pain and anguish often mar the royalty of gold-crowned power, and moisten with tears the veil of radiant beauty, and mingle bitter drops in the laborer's cup of joy, they also cast their shadows on the peasant at the plow, and on the Indian in the wilderness. So widespread are they, so stubborn and so common, that they have furnished material for a creed, whose first article is "misery" and the last "oblivion." Arthur Schopenhauer is the gloomy parent, at least in modern times, of this bewildering and dreary faith; and if we would form an idea of the terrible outcome of its despairing hope, we need only read some lines from the pen of Robert Buchanan, entitled *The New Buddha*, a name which he applies to its apostle:

> As ye have come, depart; as ye have risen
> To the supremest crest of suffering,
> Break, overflow, subside, and cease forever.
> Man hears. He feels, though all the rest be false,

One thing is certain—sleep: more precious far
Than any weary walkings in the sun.
Shall not the leafy world even as a flower
Be wither'd in its season; or, grown cold,
Even like a snow-flake melting in the light,
Fade very silently, and pass away
As it had never been? Shall man, predoom'd,
Cling to his sinking straw of consciousness,
Fight with the choking waters in his throat,
And gasp aloud, "More life, O God, more life!
More pain, O God"? * * * Nay, let him silently,
Bowing his head, like some spent swimmer, sink
Without a sigh into the blest abyss
Dark with the shipwreck of the nations, strewn
With bones of generations—lime of shells
That once were quick and lived. Even at this hour
He pauses, doubting, with the old fond cry,
Dreaming that some miraculous hand may snatch
His spirit from the waters! Let him raise
His vision upward, and with one last look,
Ere all is o'er, behold "Nirwâna" writ
Across the cruel heavens above his head,
In fiery letters, fading characters
Of dying planets, faintly flickering suns,
Foredoom'd like him to waste away and fade,
Extinguish'd in the long eternal night.

We have no sympathy with this forlorn gospel of desolation. It proceeds on the untenable assumption that back of all things is only an Infinite Malevolence, an impersonal Will governed by measureless maliciousness, which has called our race into being for the satisfaction of its cruelty, having arranged just enough torture to render existence a burden, and yet not quite enough to drive the tortured to suicide. God forgive the morose philosopher who has given currency to so coarse a slander. We here enter our earnest protest against the systematized and logically arranged wretchedness. It is sheer nonsense, madness, the corpse of common sense, and the charnel

house of love. We suspect its author is the victim of hallucination, just as we fear that Robert Burns, who has given us "Holy Willie's Prayer," "The Twa Dogs," and "Rattlin' Roarin' Willie," had reached the melancholy stage of inebriation when he wrote, "Man was made to mourn." He was made for no such thing, and we question whether Robert himself in his heart held to any such doleful belief. There is sorrow enough in the world without adding a brutal theory of despair. We know that the surface of the earth shows angry scars and jagged wounds inflicted by tempestuous fires; but we also know that it is rich with golden fields, and beautiful with flowers. So in this life of ours. There are abundant curses everywhere; but there are blessings as well. The race has much to endure; but it has also much to enjoy. Its iniquities, whether individual or communal, entail inevitable penalties; but then its virtues yield varied and enduring rewards. There are broad streams of sunshine breaking through the clouds which surround it, and silvery stars sparkling in the night-canopy that covers it. Oh! let not our tears blind us to the good, because we grow heart-sick at the evil; and let us not blaspheme the love of our Creator, because his law decrees that we shall eat the bitter fruit of our shameful doings!

Though, as we have said, all forms of sufferings are not the product of Society, nevertheless its spirit and structure have much to do in determining their character. That is, while all sorrows have a common rootage in sin, some may be classed as "human," as those which are inseparable from man as man; and others as "social," as those which are stimulated by the organization, the temper and habits of Society. Is is of the latter we would treat in this paper, and particularly of those which are indigenous to our own age.

There is generally a class of persons in every com-

munity who stubbornly refuse to submit to the wholesome laws which have been enacted for its safety and well-being. They are not victims, they are villains; they have not been driven into evil courses; they have either deliberately chosen them, or they have drifted into them on the broad, glittering stream of temptation. As long as they continue in this way there is no possible relief from misery. Sentimentalists ought seriously to consider this. Benevolent persons who will not raise the wages of their employés, even though they know the wolf is howling at their door, are frequently very charitable in their judgment of loafers and loungers who have some piteous tale to tell, and not ungenerous in their pecuniary aid. Herbert Spencer describes the worthless creatures we have in view, and has developed in striking phrase the thought we are trying to express.

> They are simply good-for-nothings, who in one way or other live on the good-for-somethings—vagrants and sots, criminals and those on the way to crime, youths who are burdens on hard-worked parents, men who appropriate the wages of their wives, fellows who share the gains of prostitutes; and then, less visible and less numerous, there is a corresponding class of women.
>
> Is it natural that happiness should be the lot of such? or is it natural that they should bring unhappiness on themselves and those connected with them? Is it not manifest that there must exist in our midst an immense amount of misery which is a normal result of misconduct, and ought not to be dissociated from it? There is a notion always more or less prevalent and just now vociferously expressed, that all social suffering is removable, and that it is the duty of somebody or other to remove it. Both these beliefs are false. To separate pain from ill-doing is to fight against the constitution of things, and will be followed by far more pain. Saving men from the natural penalties of dissolute living, eventually necessitates the infliction of artificial penalties in solitary cells, on tread-wheels, and by the lash. I suppose a dictum on which the current creed and the creed of science are at one, may be considered to have as high an authority as can be found. Well, the command "if any would not work neither should he eat," is simply a Christian enunciation of that

universal law of Nature under which life has reached its present height—the law that a creature not energetic enough to maintain itself must die; the sole difference being that the law which in the one case is to be artificially enforced, is, in the other case, a natural necessity. And yet this particular tenet of their religion which science so manifestly justifies is the one which Christians seem the least inclined to accept. The current assumption is that there should be no suffering, and that society is to blame for that which exists.

From the tenor of these remarks it must be evident that the current assumption is indeed misleading. There are pangs and penalties which we cannot relieve. They are the result of man's evil-doing, and he would as surely have transgressed in a desert as in a city. We cannot, as Mr. Spencer declares, separate the wrong-doing from painful consequences. The effort to do so is itself an attack on the settled order of the universe. It would, moreover, be as absurd as would be an assault on the law of gravity. Rest satisfied we can never successfully fight against God either in the domain of physics or of morals. As you walk through a community and behold squalor, filth and beggary, do not hastily ascribe them exclusively to the inequalities and selfishness of Society. They frequently proceed, first of all, from the violation of God's law, and only in a secondary degree from the neglect of man's. Harlots, drunkards, idlers, are fearful possibilities under any style of government, and the Almighty means that no government shall shield them from his punishments. It follows, then, that no community, however ideally formed and righteously administered, can ever be entirely free from spectacles of woe as long as one transgressor remains a citizen. That one wretch will inevitably find for himself a lash, and a crown of thorns for wife and children; and God's retributions will certainly overtake him, however philanthropic and paternal the State may be. Discrimination is important. Wide-sweeping denun-

ciations are out of place. Society is doubtless to blame for much of the suffering that rouses our sympathies, but not for all. The responsibility is largely personal and individual; and when red-nosed, watery-eyed, pimple-cheeked loungers murmur against the civic order, and with hiccoughs manifold, and with much maudlin gravity, recommend national reforms, they ought at once to be emphatically told that no schemes can bring relief as long as they, and such as they, do not reform themselves, or remove their carcasses to the obscurity of the cemetery.

We fear, however, that the error into which many of our good people have fallen has prevented the worthless classes from occasionally edifying the country with that pleasing spectacle, called in the German tongue "*Harugari*," which has done so much for Japan. It is clear that we do not sufficiently encourage our riffraff to acts of heroic self-immolation; and some among us so flatter them, especially at election times, that they come to think of themselves as public benefactors. Sentimental philanthropists assure us that they are our brothers, and ought to be led back to a nobler life. We, too, believe they should be reclaimed; but so long as they are made prominent in politics, and so long as they are encouraged to esteem themselves our real rulers, we are deceiving them as to their worth, and burdening ourselves with lazy rascals, though not lazy in rascality. We rather think that Carlyle is not far from the mark when he thus writes of those whom he calls a "beautiful black peasantry," with the "devil at their elbow."

Brotherhood? * * * Does the Christian or any religion prescribe love of scoundrels then? I hope it prescribes a healthy hatred of scoundrels—otherwise what am I, in heaven's name, to make of it? Me, for one, it will not serve as a religion on those strange terms. Just hatred of scoundrels, I say; fixed, irreconcilible, inexorable enmity to the enemies of God; this, and not love for them, and incessant whitewashing, and dressing and cockering

of them, must, if you look into it, be the backbone of any human religion whatsoever. Christian religion! In what words can I address you, ye unfortunates, sunk in the slushy ooze till the worship of mud-serpents, and unutterable pythons and poisonous slimy monstrosities seems to you the worship of God? This is the rotten carcass of Christianity; this malodorous phosphorescence of *post mortem* sentimentality.

This language is harsh, after the manner of the man, but the thought behind is neither unwise nor unjust. We have of late set up reformed drunkards and jail-birds to exhort in the name of Christ a better class than themselves. They have been made so much of that not a few of them talk as though there was something commendable in their old pursuits, and as though they themselves were objects to be admired. And as to Carlyle, so it has seemed to us, that some members of the church have for several years past been worshiping "pythons and poisonous slimy monstrosities." If such persons give evidence of conversion let them cordially be received by the church; but for the sake of "the sluggard-scoundrelism" yet in the world, let them not be thrust forward into conspicuous places, as though idleness, wife-beating and drunkenness did not really impair one's hope of glory. We are opposed to pampering. It is our belief if intemperance were dealt with as a crime, and wife-beating as a piece of deviltry to be paid in the same coin, only with more of it, we should be amply rewarded by a notable diminution of misery. We are convinced that idlers should be compelled to work. They owe something to the State, and ought not to be allowed to burden it with an unproductive existence. Citizens who furnish by their laziness the best of evidences that they will not labor to provide for themselves, ought to be treated as parasites, as creatures who are willing to take but not ready to give, and so forfeit their liberty for a season in the interest of industry. A little wholesome discipline of this nature would bring thousands to their senses. And

if it were followed for a time by decided failure on the part of respectable people to acknowledge them anywhere; and if the same people would courteously respond to the nod or the bow of the toil-stained mechanic on the street, as though to say we pay a tribute to self-reliant labor, the discipline would be more efficacious, and soon it would not be required at all. Be it understood that in this recommendation we are not countenancing Communism or Paternalism; we are simply laying down the principle that the citizen has received much from the State and owes it some compensation in the way of a good character and industrious habits; and that if he fails in one or both, he should be made to pay what he owes, and when he recognizes the obligation practically, he should be allowed to choose his own calling and be left free to follow it.

While in many instances suffering is self-caused, in others it is due to the exacting pursuits and avocations of modern civilization. From what sources do all the busy crowds that jostle us on the streets derive their support? They all live, but how? As we see in the shops the delicate fabrics, the elegant jewelry, the gorgeous furniture, we naturally think of the thousands of artisans employed in their production, and of the other thousands we may say millions, who make the brick and rear the houses where they are stored, and who procure the raw material from which they are manufactured. A whole world of activity sweeps before us, and we are pleased with the results of human toil, and rejoice that men and women are occupied so usefully and ingeniously. But there is another side to the picture. Out of these and kindred creations there not only comes wealth and prosperity; but likewise in connection with them we have physical infirmities, mental depressions, and often moral deterioration. Enter a cotton factory or a flax mill and you will observe that the children are pale and undergrown, that the men

are attenuated and weak, that the women are emaciated and stunted; and you will learn that, owing to the confinement, the artificial heat, the monotony of the work, and the dust from the material used, only one out of every five of the boys and girls will reach the age of twenty; and that the average life-rate among the adults is 38.92 years for men, and 27.98 for women. Farmers average 65.19; and from this high figure one can judge how exacting and exhausting the entire factory system must be. It breeds consumption, induces premature enfeeblement of the vital organs, and so brings with it untold misery of mind and body. But in these respects it is not alone. While it may be foremost as a destroyer it is not solitary. Let the trades pass in review and you will behold an army of invalids, groaning, wailing, staggering on its forced march to the grave. There are the hatters, asthmatic and bilious; the tailors, narrow-chested and debilitated; the brass-founders, with their difficulty of breathing, and their cramps and their nausea; the masons, with their diseases arising from the stone-dust they inhale; the makers of colored papers and artificial flowers, with their tumors, ulcers and poisonings from the arsenic they employ; the workers in phosphorus, with their sores and the eating away of their flesh; and with these, the smelters, potters, painters, type-founders, plumbers, who have to handle lead, and who in doing so are smitten in their nerves and often paralyzed in brain. And these are only part of the melancholy procession. We have said nothing of the sickly host of women who stitch, stitch, stitch, or drive the sewing-machine and slowly waste away to the sound of its unmusical click; nor have we spoken of other callings, such as are followed in the mines, on the railroad and on the sea, and which bring their own infirmities, perils and losses. Enough, however, has been said to show that the pursuits which have so much to do with the development of material civilization

have proven infinitely more fatal than battle or shipwreck.

But this is not all. In other directions we find scores of men prematurely old, disordered and undone. Commercial life in our times is almost as trying as the mechanical. The workman who plods along early in the morning with his noontide meal may envy the merchant who has not yet risen from his bed; but if he only knew the care and anxiety that awaits him on his waking, he would hesitate to exchange places with him. An immense amount of pity is lavished on the laboring classes—and rightly, too—but there is not enough bestowed on the mercantile classes, on those whose thinking and financiering keep the many wheels of civilization in motion. They have burdens to bear, disappointments to meet and failures to endure, which may depress their spirits, derange their nerves, prostrate their strength and sometimes unhinge their reason. Business excitement so high that mental and physical exhaustion follow; and then to recover the tone of the system, stimulants are frequently resorted to, which, in the long run, end in terrible disaster. The gloom engendered in the counting-room is carried to the home, and domestic bliss is unhappily beclouded. Religion is neglected; for the unnatural strain endured during the week unfits for the quiet of the Sabbath, and leaves neither vigor nor taste for church and its soul-refreshing services. The moral life consequently declines, and many families become shallow, frivolous and weak, victims who are being prepared for untold agonies in the future. So trying and maddening are these occupations that existence itself grows wearisome. Some end it violently; and others, heartbroken, thankfully drop into the seclusion of the grave. In Europe we heard a clergyman say that he had read on the tombstone of a diligent merchant: "He never took any

vacation till he came here;" and, alas! it is true, so exacting are business demands, that many who are engaged in its service find it next to impossible to obtain a respite, and have only a hope of vacation in the other world, as it is very certain they will never have any in this.

It must be evident to the most unreflecting that if these causes are left to operate throughout the world the race must be seriously, if not irremediably, injured. In no way can the result be avoided except through the action of radical reform. It is only a question of time now. There are enough forces actively engaged to effect our destruction; and yet the destruction can be averted if we address ourselves to the work promptly and vigorously. What ought we to do? We will answer this question by asking another. A government was founded in this land some hundred years ago; but for what purpose? Did our fathers establish our institutions that money might be coined out of the fields, or that humanity might through liberty be trained and developed? Was the experiment designed to show how much cash we could collect in our coffers, or was it meant to show how much of true manhood could be concentrated in our citizens? Were we in a public meeting we would vote for the manhood side of this issue, and on a platform we would speak in its favor; but in our practical business affairs we usually act contrary to both vote and speech. We extol sentiment before a popular audience, and straightway ignore it in private. Material things possess a greater charm for us than for those who founded the Republic. They sought ways and means by which all classes might be guarded and encouraged; but we seem to be unwilling that our burdened ones should even have the opportunity of caring for themselves. Surely we ought to return to the spirit of our sires and seek to carry out the great end they contemplated. Let us see how this thought is related to the subject in hand.

Undoubtedly perils of various kinds cannot be altogether avoided in maintaining and advancing civilization; but if we are influenced by the example of our revolutionary heroes, we will seek to reduce them to the minimum. This is our duty. We see that thousands of people are being sacrificed annually, and we ought either to take adequate measures for their security or we should dispense with articles for which the price of blood has to be paid. Oh, believe us, they are not worth the awful cost. The Leaders of Society ought to lay this solemn responsibility to heart. But if they are dilatory, there are sufficient grounds for the State to interpose. To crowd an unseaworthy vessel with passengers and send it across the sea is a criminal offense; and we do not see why filling badly ventilated rooms, destitute of fire-escapes, with tailors, sewing women, or operatives, should not be equally criminal; or why carelessness in exposing them to the injurious effects of materials used in their calling should not be severely punished. The government should exercise a more complete oversight of manufactories than it does: and should exact the fulfillment of such conditions as are necessary to the comfort and safety of wage-workers. In doing this it would do no more than it does when it inspects the boilers of vessels going to ply on the sea or lakes; and no more than it does when it tries to shield the public against the impositions of distillers and from the inroads of cholera. It could in this way diminish disease, prolong life and promote the happiness of a large portion of our population.

Science also should exert itself in this cause, should point out the wholesale murder involved in our frantic endeavors to be rich, and should interest itself in providing means to avert the mischievous action of dusts and poisons which render hazardous various vocations. Let a body of scientists in England and America come together and speak

authoritatively on these points, and they would be better engaged than in defending Darwinism and the "Descent of Man;" and would perform a service which future generations would remember as tending to accelerate his "ascent." It is said that not a few learned books touch on these subjects? Granted: but what is needed is not a mere allusion, or even a treatise cast on the world to find for itself readers. We rather need, yea, necessity demands, that Science shall openly espouse the cause of humanity, and through its representatives speak boldly and clearly from its unbiased stand point on the duties of the State and of employers. It is probably indispensable to the sympathic advocacy of measures of relief that the heart should be sensibly touched by the woes of others; and surely it is not too much to assume that among all the brillant men who give themselves to physical researches there are many who have been thus affected, and who are ready to do something practical. Let them act; and let them also join forces with the Church, and impress upon this feverish, restless and grasping age the importance of moderation. A sentiment needs to be created in favor of self-restraint. Were desires duly curbed the world would be much better off. If merchants were not in a hurry to amass wealth they would escape much wear and tear, and they would live longer, and their clerks would live longer as well. Could Science and Religion hand in hand awaken Society to the appreciation of the value of self-abnegation, much of the sorrow that now afflicts us would cease. Then would fewer Board of Trade operators be smitten with uncontrollable nervousness; fewer stock-brokers would be tempted to speculate, and failing in their calculations fail also in their health; and fewer would grow away from the affection of their families and die of a broken heart. When Mr. Spencer visited our shores and saw us he read the story of our immoderation in our faces, and recommended

judicious recreation. Mr. Lowell remarks that our sires grew melancholy and atrabilious from long fasting and from over much prayer. This, however, is not the cause of our permanent seriousness and of our careworn appearance. We are lean, yellow and shrunken because our craving for secular gain is insatiable. Let us by all means seek amusement; but in addition let us learn that it is neither wise nor fair to develop all the resources of our country in a single generation, leaving nothing for posterity to do. If we can only be made to feel this, then will we pause, and breathing deeply and calmly will say to each other, "go slow," and "let us sit down beneath the trees and rest awhile."

From what we have just written it seems probable that indifference and criminal carelessness are directly responsible for many of the sufferings endured by Society. This is indeed the case, but as yet we have not attempted to give an adequate conception of their prevalence. We desire now to remedy this defect; and as a fitting introduction, we copy this significant paragraph from *Truth*, London, July 20, 1885:

"The nearer the Church the farther from grace," says the adage, and it would almost seem as if the people who are nearest the Bible are farthest from justice. If it be true that the women who are engaged in the production of cheap Bibles are almost the worst paid in London, the fact is a very disgraceful one. It is, no doubt, a very good thing to send cheap Bibles to the heathen: but if the people who are engaged in folding and binding them are half-starved in order to do it, we are likely to make more heathens at home than we convert abroad. Missionary enthusiasts should remember that charity, and also justice, should begin at home, and that there is not much religion where these are absent.

We are of those who agree with the editor. We cannot believe that Bibles stained with injustice and sent abroad at the cost of the indigent, and in disregard of their welfare, whose cause it continually advocates, will be

blessed of God. Good books are well, but good characters are better; and the course of the publishing house evidently tends to produce more of the former and less of the latter than is wholesome. We cannot suspect the heads of this house of a deliberate intent to grind the face of the poor. Their solemn and religious avocation surely precludes such baseness. We must, therefore, conclude that the cause of their singular, unchristian conduct must be an unhappy oversight. Perhaps they read about the markets, how every one gets everything as cheap as possible, and they became ambitious that as large a margin of profit should be shown in their business as in that of others. they may have formed their idea of duty from accounts of wages paid in other industries, and may have decided on their course toward the women they employ by reports, say, of those shirt-making girls whose protest against the reduction of their scanty income was blandly but imperiously rejected. The account of the protest, which accompanied what was really a strike, we find in *New York Herald*, April 24, 1885, and from it the unsophisticated may gain an idea of the difference between the rewards of capital and labor. The story is in the form of an interview, and here is the report:

"This is the third reduction since last January. If we accepted it we could not make on an average more than $3 a week, and we thought it was time to strike. I have now to make twenty-four sleeves, stitched down on both sides, for nine and a half cents. I have been four years an operator. I know my business, and the most I can make in the winter time, when we are all busy, will not average $6 per week. The firm is a very rich firm, and I don't blame them so much as the forewoman. She thinks it is to her interest to keep us down in price, and she told Mr. Wallach that we would work for these reduced rates. She is mistaken, and now the firm is advertising for girls to work at the rates we have refused. We want the girls who apply to know what it is they are going to do, and we think when they know what the facts are they will not go and do this work at these prices."

"What does the labor on a dozen of shirts amount to?" asked the reporter.

"On the fine class of shirts made by this firm about $1.25."

"And the material, what would that cost?"

"Not more than fifty cents a shirt at the outside."

"Then the cost of labor and material is about $7.50 per dozen. What are these shirts sold at?"

"These shirts I have been describing are sold at about $18 to $18.50 per dozen, retail. I don't know what the firm gets for them at wholesale prices, but I should think from $15 to $16. We think at these rates of profit they could afford to pay us better prices,"

We think so, too. Now in this case we cannot for a moment suppose that there was any mistake made by the manufacturers of shirts. Undoubtedly they calculated nicely as to their profits, and screwed every one in their service down to the lowest point. They evidently knew what they were about, just as many of our rolling-mill companies do when they lower the wages of workmen—shame on them!—to pay a higher dividend, or to continue an existing one, to the stockholders. Such meanness surpasses the power of pen to describe. When it is imitated by Bible societies it will be characterized in a similar way, and ought to be; unless it can be shown that it really proceeded from ignorance of what it costs the girls to live, and from a fatal misunderstanding of the iniquity and grasping avarice involved in the shirtmaking *imbroglio*. It is barely possible that we have done this Bible multiplying agency an injustice in supposing it to be as innocent of the ways of the world as we have assumed. If such should be the case, we pray in a spirit which we fear approaches an anathema, that the Lord will deal with it: and will have it so graciously arranged that it shall not make two heathen at home for every one saved in foreign lands. But whatever may be true of this particular agency, there are many people who have no idea how millions get a living. They are not hard-hearted,

they do not mean to be indifferent to the welfare of others, and yet they are oblivious to the appalling scenes that are enacted near them. Crowds surge by them on the streets and they feel no more identity with them then they do with the stones beneath their feet. They never ask themselves whether these multitudes can be helped, or whether they have sorrows, or whether they are discouraged and starving. Plaintively has the poet sung on this phase of selfishness:

Ah! sad enough is the picture, and little we dream or know
Of the terrible storms encountered, the anguish and sore distress
Of many we daily meet in our journeying to and fro,
Whom we never have thought to pity, and never have cared to bless
And driven before the wind of a merciless, cruel fate,
Like vessels shorn of their sails, and urged to a rocky shore,
Bereft of their early hopes, and swept from their high estate,
Pitiful wrecks! they're stranded close to the pawnshop door.

Yes, and alas! many are driven to another door, far more humiliating than that of the pawnshop, and over which might well be written, "whoso enters here leaves hope behind." And many who are instrumental in hastening them downward to such a destiny have never suspected themselves of being charged with any responsibility in the matter. But, fine lady, when you beat down the poor sewing girl in her price, found such fault with the milliner's work that she was obliged to give you nearly all of it for nothing, and when you tortured your housemaids with your dyspepsia and your moody tempers, and intimated to every woman in distress who sought your alms that she was no better than she should be, you were surely, though perhaps undesignedly, adding to the load these unfortunate ones had to carry, and were not only robbing them of hope, but of virtue as well. How will you answer your Creator when He inquires of you regarding your poor sister? Will you reply, "Why, really, I was not

acquainted with her, and she never moved in our circle"? Ah! it is more than probable when such a question is asked you will be dumb; for then, if not before, you will have a consciousness that your duty to your sister demanded more than a feeling that you never voluntarily and maliciously harmed her—namely, that you should have taken account of her needs, and earnestly have sought to advance her interests. In these few words we have clearly indicated our obligation, which if discharged, would soften many a rugged way, and bind up many bleeding feet. Were we only considerate, charity would rarely be required, and idlers would soon be ashamed to show themselves. Active concern for the welfare of those who are dependent would cost but little money, and would diminish many a care, and would make the poor happier and more contented. Fitz John Porter, in *North American Review* for October, 1885, describes such an instance of solicitude for the working classes as we have in mind, and which, in spirit at least, can be copied by all who desire to be their friendly helpers:

> There is a factory in one of the large manufacturing towns of the country where one of the employers, imbued with true Christian philanthropy, brings himself down to a level with his hundreds of employés. He mingles with their families; finds out the social state and wants of all; gives a word of advice to one; imparts counsel to another; sympathizes with the mourner; puts his strong arm around the weak; and employs all of his ability to raise his workingmen in the scale of human existence. He provides a reading room for them, furnishes them with reading matter, and gives them lectures. Let this example be emulated by every employer in the land, and riots would be impossible.

Yes, and more than riot would be suppressed; many a heart-sigh would be hushed, many a tear would be dried, and many a wounded soul would once more believingly pray to God were this man's example generally followed.

While referring to oversights and neglects, and what

comes of them, permit us to call attention to other cases equally grave. It is reasonable to suppose that many of our citizens have read the tales of horror we are constrained to republish ; and perhaps, too, more of a similar character, and yet the impressions made by them may have been transient on account of the failure to feel any personal responsibility for the enormities enacted. Of course it is familiar to all of you that county, city of State governments provide Poorhouses and Asylums of various kinds for the benefit of unfortunates. These are charitable institutions ; but of late it has seemed as though charity had forsaken some of them ; or, what is more likely, had been summarily shown the door as an intruder. Discoveries are constantly being made of brutality, cruelty and savagery triumphing and reveling in these refuges supposed to be consecrated to beneficence. These revelations have startled the country ; they fill the indigent with dismay, and call for some adequate interposition. It may be remembered how the Old Ladies' Home, one of the most worthy charities in Chicago, was dragged into the newspapers, and how charges of unkind treatment were preferred against the matron. This controversy was a painful one. Some of the most venerable beneficiaries could not tolerate the management of those times. We shall not enter into the particulars. A far worse illustration of what we are here condemning is furnished by the notable examination of the Tewksbury, Mass., Almshouse, where outrages and abominations too fearful to rehearse were brought to light. When these reports were read it almost seemed as though Satan had usurped the honorable position of Poorhouse Overseer. From among a multitude of other cases which we have collected there are two that render vivid the evils we complain of, and which inspire us with detestation of the rascally principals. These instances we give in the language of the newspapers

that reported the tragedies. Halifax journals recount with thrilling minuteness the burning of the city Poor Asylum, in which over thirty pauper inmates were burned to death. In describing this event the reporter of the *Times* details what unexpected horrible things were revealed during the search made into the origin of the fire. He writes :

Those in the Halifax poor-house, the inquiry showed, were by no means fed as ordinary mortals should be ; the supply of food was not even so great that they might eat and satisfy their hunger. As Oliver Twist rose with his breakfast bowl from among his dozen equally unhappy and almost wholly unfed comrades, and lifted his frail voice in pleading for his famous "more," so in something of a like manner did these poor inmates of the Halifax asylum utter a weak protest against the scanty fare dealt out to them by a too economical board of commissioners. Seldom were there less than four hundred people in the building, and yet at a time when there was at least that number the amount of milk allowed to be daily consumed, one of the old commissioners examined at the investigation told, reached the generous proportion of thirty quarts, an average of a little over a half a gill for each, or about a pint per week. On this grand amount of the most nourishing food they received, and the other in probably like quantities, the larger number of these people were expected to recover from illness and bring back the vigor of health ; children, of which there were not a few, to flourish and grow on and become strongly developed young lads and girls, The ex-commissioner who told this in his examination said he had called the attention of the others on the board to the disgraceful extent they were going to keep down expenses. "But we must economize," they replied ; "keep the expenditure down to the lowest possible."

The work of economizing went on, and the supply of milk did not increase. The new board came in a few years ago and they economized, too ; they attempted to save more than their predecessors did. One of their number said at the investigation they had the satisfaction of being able to cut down the daily cost of the support of each pauper one-half cent more. Pious sympathy and advice were once given by the city clergymen paid for their services, but their remuneration was withdrawn and the sick and dying received their visits when it suited their convenience to come. The pay of those

doing the great amount of work required in the running of such an immense institution—the bakers, cooks, engineer, fireman, wardens, nurses, of everybody connected with the building under the superintendent—was also either decreased or taken away altogether, and at last almost the only one receiving remuneration for his services was the engineer, one or two of the remainder, made up of pauper inmates, getting perhaps $1 per month. And now the result of all this great curtailment of expenditure has come, and the public have risen in indignation at the inexcusable carelessness of the board of charities in not providing an efficient fire brigade in the building to protect the safety of its inmates. The investigation demanded has closed—with what satisfaction? The real origin of the fire is as great a mystery as ever; the parties principally to be blamed for the great sacrifice of human life move and breathe as freely as before, because no proof pointing directly to criminal negligence of duty on their part is to be obtained.

And so it seems these wretched creatures were left to starve and freeze by a Christian city, and these enormities might have continued but for the searching and revealing power of fire. But before we comment directly on this case, let us look at another. This one is American. The place, the House of Refuge, Toledo, O.; the special victims were boys and girls, one of whom through a happy train of circumstances made his escape, and related this story of his sufferings before a magistrate:

After the men arrested me I was handcuffed, put on a train and taken to Toledo. The men didn't tell me what I had done, didn't show me any papers, and didn't take me into any court or before any judge. In the refuge I had to make twenty beds, scrub a floor, and knit thirty-six pairs of socks with a machine a day, whether sick or well. Every boy who fails to knit his full quota of socks gets whipped. Superintendent McDonald does the whipping himself. He uses a strap cut out of sole leather, about two feet long and a quarter of an inch thick. He'd make us get down on our hands and knees when he'd whip us. These are marks of some of the whippings I got (and he rolled up the leg of his pantaloons and showed cruel scars). I have them all over my body. McDonald would nearly always whip us till the blood would run. Once I fainted twice during the whipping. The reason I wouldn't be let home with

my brother when he came after me in September was that I was sick in bed from a whipping I got and had cuts all over my back and legs. McDonald didn't want to let me out in that condition. The food we got wasn't fit to eat. The meat would often be running alive with maggots. One hungry boy was whipped till he couldn't stand up for stealing a piece of chicken off McDonald's table. We usen't to go to school except when the directors or members of the legislature would be coming. Whenever they came McDonald would warn us to behave well, and to tell any of the legislators who might ask us how we liked the refuge that we liked it ever so much, and would rather be in it than in our own homes. In the winter we had to carry the ice up from the river to fill the ice-houses.

We have read authenticated accounts in the English blue books which go to show that the condition of the old-time slaves in America was really more tolerable than that of the Englsh factory worker at the beginning of the present century; but however wretched and abused these poor toilers may have been, the victims of Halifax and Toledo savagery have touched as deep a depth of misery. These blue books describe the deadly overtaxing of women and children in mills and mines some ninety years ago. Then they were driven by the lash, and then men were crazed by excessive burdens, then womanhood lost all semblance to itself and perished by inches at the looms, and then boys and girls were scourged and often killed by brutal overseers. How like such accounts are to the disreputable doings of which we have just read. Paupers, too, are kicked, beaten, starved, left to burn or rot; the cruelties inflicted on them being all the more fearful on account of their helpless, forlorn and dependent position. We are not going to assert that in general the conduct of our public institutions is reprehensible and vicious; for we do not believe any such thing. As a rule their management was never better than it is now; but we are afraid that exceptions to the rule are neither few nor slight. What we specially complain of is, that when these exceptions are

disclosed, the howl of popular indignation they excite usually dies away, and but little, if anything, of a practical character is undertaken to prevent the possibility of their repetition elsewhere. The impression made by them is often transient. No one feels any particular responsibility for a reform and the normal condition of indifference is speedily restored. An end should be put to these scandals, and we have one or two simple suggestions to offer regarding the best way of doing it. We would have charges of harshness, neglect and maltreatment, when they need to be made, brought not merely against the overseers of public institutions, but, in a sense, also against the officials who appointed them. If a commander accepts a crew, and if through their inefficiency the vessel is lost, we do not exonerate the officer for he ought to have known the men to whose bravery and skill so many interests had to be confided. They are condemned, but he is not excused. We pronounce him culpable; for he must either have been incompetent to select and govern the sailors, or indifferent to their character, and on either supposition he had no business to tread the quarterdeck. So, likewise, when the head of an insane asylum, or of any other State charity, seems to find pleasure in choking the inmates, or permits male wardens and nurses to invade the privacy of the women, and confines those who have incurred his displeasure in dark cells; or, in a word, acts as an oriental despot—and such a one was found in a Chicago institution only a few months since—not only should he be imprisoned at hard labor in proportion to the sum of his villainy, but the magistrate who appointed him should be impeached and deposed from his office. By favoritism or negligence such a magistrate insults the majesty of the citizen in the person of the poor, and he should be remanded to private life. Were he in wholesome fear of such retribution he would be careful to

commission only responsible persons, and he would take pains to see that they did their duty faithfully and efficiently. We believe in a system of checks and balances, not only in the general government, but in the administration of communal and national philanthropy as well. It is impossible to forget the woman who professed to nurse newborn babes, and who found it convenient to let the little creatures fade and die; nor can we have failed to hear of some policemen who are proficient in the use of their clubs, now hammering away at a helpless and unresisting prostitute, and then smashing the heads of harmless people who happened to be on the streets during the car-driver's strike of 1885. Certainly a rigid system of checks is imperatively demanded. We arrange one very promptly when gold is at stake. Is humanity less precious than the precious metal? No American will surely admit that it is. Yet the majority of us do not bend as much as our little finger to prevent the abuses we have described. The heathen whom we are seeking to evangelize teach us a diviner way. In Japan the man or woman who countenances cruelty toward a child is execrated; but what shall be said of those persons professing Christianity, who know of the outrages committed beneath our skies, and who yet pursue their way with no tears in their eyes, or help in their hands, complacently singing, as though it were their dearest creed,—

> He prayeth best who loveth best
> All things, both great and small,
> For the dear God who loveth us,
> He made and loveth all?

We shall not answer. Possibly our reply would not be complimentary. But let it suffice, in one thing at least, the Japanese must stand nearer to the heart of God than the formal Christian who has hardly a thought beyond the arduous task of being "stylish," and who has more concern for an opera cloak than for the girl who

made it; and who by her petty tyranny slowly crushed out the life of the poor seamstress now sleeping in a pauper's grave and waiting for the just Jehovah to take vengeance on her adversary. Well may the fine, sordid lady fear the scrutiny of the "Coming Day," and well may all selfish, egotistical and negligent magistrates, and all who have heaped cruelties on the unfortunate, dread His righteous and impartial retribution.

The competitions of Society are as fruitful in suffering as either of the causes on which we have animadverted. They constitute one of the most distinguishing features of our commercial period; but while they have led to many temporal blessings they have contributed, likewise, to the increase of misery. Without them, as has frequently been proved, stagnation would ensue; but with them, as is evident everywhere, adulterations and other impositions are multiplied. Competition is a force, an incentive. It is very like a horse race, in that the intense spirit of rivalry, while it stimulates progress, induces gambling and fraud as well. To it we owe the cheapening of various articles by which they are placed within the reach of persons of limited incomes; but then it has likewise served to create a desire for these articles without proportionately raising the wages of the artisan. Cheap goods often mean cheap labor. Hence we frequently have what is termed overproduction. In reality the world has never yet been favored with what this word seems to import. There has never been at one time more clothing and other necessaries than were required to provide for the needs of the people; there has frequently been more than they could pay for. The citizens of our country are the largest consumers of our productions; and when these are increased beyond their ability to purchase, but not their ability to use, cries of "overproduction" arise on one side and of distress on the other. Manufacturers

rush forward, seeking to outstrip each other, supposing that foreign markets will relieve them of their stock, and apparently indifferent to the effect of their competition on the market at home. For the sake of supplying the former they keep the wages of their operatives down to the lowest point, and thus reduce the purchasing power of the latter. The foreign market, unless wars are being waged, does not remunerate as they expected; the home market has been impoverished, and so they find themselves with more material on hand than can be disposed of, and looms are stopped, mills closed and general financial stringency prevails. It is apparent from these constantly recurring depressions that competition is carried too far, and that it ought to be restrained by the consideration that its abuse will in the long run frustrate its object. We read in the *Inter Ocean* of July 1st, 1879, of a wretched tailor who committed suicide near the Douglas monument, because he had been thrown out of employment. He had demanded a half a cent more than he received for each piece he pressed, and another man undertook to do it for less. Having children to support, and seeing no place for himself in the world, he got out of it. We blame him for his cowardice, but we also blame his fellow-craftsman for his rivalry; and above all we blame the employer for his despicable greed. Both the rival and the employer carried competition to the extreme of insanity; and if it is ever to be pushed in this manner, the despairing sorrow of our poor tailor will overtake thousands. This principle uncontrolled by Christian sentiment and unchecked by some other principle, such as coöperation, leads merchants to unjustifiable acts. To prevent others from succeding in their line they frequently try to undersell them; and to make up their losses underpay their clerks; and thus bankrupt the one and impoverish the other. A former dry goods

dealer of New York is credited with these disreputable practices by which his millions were multiplied. And we are not surprised that the late Mr. Vanderbilt did everthing he could to obtain control of contending railroads; for his father, the Commodore, it is said, ran a ferry-boat in opposition to his mother. "What is bred in the bone will never be out in the flesh."

Though much more could be written regarding the evils of excessive competition we shall not dishearten our readers with further sickening details, but attempt, what must be of more interest to them, to indicate how it can be kept within reasonable bounds. We would suggest at the outset that as the home consumption of what we produce is a more important item than the demands of foreign countries wages should always be the last thing to reduce. Do not cripple your buyers, and the greatest number of buyers is composed of working people. In our opinion employers should agree among themselves on the highest rates that can be afforded in return for labor; and the rivalry between them should consist in the energy, tact and push they can introduce into the conduct of their business. An illustration of our meaning is furnished by the New York Stock Exchange. There the same commissions are charged, and the difference in results depends on the nerve and discernment of the operator. One succeeds where another becomes bankrupt; but the one does not bid for custom by accepting a quarter or an eighth of a cent less than the other. Every vocation ought to have its guild, and each guild should determine along what lines competition is honorable and advantageous to the country at large. Were the artisan not only paid a fixed price, but allowed a certain percentage of the profits proportionate to his good behavior, industry and skill, a judicious rivalry would be stimulated, and from it would result greater contentment, more self-respect and a superior quality of workmanship.

By some such arrangements as these the relations between capital and labor would not be as strained as they are now; there would be far less distress and suffering in the land, and the possibility of strikes would be reduced to the minimum. This is unquestionably a most desirable end to be gained. Strikes are a costly and a very unsatisfactory luxury, particularly to the striker. They very rarely benefit him permanently, and while they may occasionally remedy some ills they are altogether too expensive and uncertain to be relied on. In 1829 the Manchester spinners lost $1,250,000 in wages; during the following year the spinners at Ashton about as much; in 1836, at Preston, $286,000, and in 1854 their successors in the mills sacrificed in thirty-six weeks $2,100,000. During the shoemakers' struggle in Chicago enough money was squandered to have started coöperative shops, where all, or nearly all, could have been employed. Nor is there any telling how many thousands have been wasted by the Knights of Labor in their unwise assault on the railroad system of the Southwest in 1866, nor how many millions have been sacrificed by hasty strikes to secure the eight-hour day. These vast sums usually come from the products of the frugal who pay their dues to the union, and are frequently wasted at the instigation of the idle and intemperate, or in their interest. Better, then, have as little to do with these heroic measures as possible, and to deprive them of their motive let the recommendations we have made be generally adopted. When the workman is treated as a man, and when he has a moderate share in the profits of the business he is helping to build up, strikes will be useless, and will be relegated to the dark past, when Political Economy was in its infancy.

We have in a previous paper referred to the value of coöperation, and we again touch on the subject because it is the true antidote of excessive competition. The one

ought to be set over against the other. Both are important, and both are needed to temper and perfect each other. Many forms of business can be organized and conducted on the principle of coöperation and many others can be rendered more just and humane by its partial adoption; but we have revived this topic in the present connection for the purpose of pointing out a special service which may be rendered by a wise combination on the part of the rich. What we have in mind would draw these two orders close together; would create a good understanding between them, and would abate manifold sufferings. We must all be aware that it is of the utmost importance that decent, comfortable dwellings, which the artisan class can call its own, should be placed within the reach of its pocket, and not too far from the workshops. The want of such homes is indeed a very actual and pressing one. Were they supplied the now afflicted inmates of squalid tenements would be saved from bad health, impure living, liquor-craving and a multitude of other curses which seem inseparable from filth, overcrowding and hopelessness. In a country like ours the difficulties surrounding this work are not insuperable, and in fact are only trifling. An example of what can be accomplished in this direction through judicious coöperation has been furnished by Havre, France; and as we read we are greatly surprised that so grand a work could be wrought so easily in the old world. The report, which we quote, was published in *The New York Examiner* several months ago:

An interesting experiment in providing homes for the poor has been for some time in progress in the city of Havre, France, under the auspices of public spirited gentlemen, among them the mayor of the city and the president of the Chamber of Commerce. They observed that the poorest people pay a higher rent for their tenements, in proportion to the accommodation they get, than those who are in more comfortable circumstances. On investigation they learned, what any tenement-house agent could have told them, that two suffi-

cient reasons exist for this discrimination—first, the tenants own no personal property which could be attached as security for the payment of the rent; and second, it costs Court of Appeals, and in the meantime punishment is delayed.

But how could the evil be remedied? The answer which these gentlemen worked out was not a strictly original one, but yet possessed some peculiarities of its own. An incorporated company was formed, with the modest capital of $40,000, to which the city added $5,000 as a gift. It was determined that four per cent interest on the investment was all that should be expected, and that the grand aim should be to enable the poor tenant to buy the house he occupied. On this basis building operations were begun. A tract of land was purchased, and divided into small lots varying in area from 1,000 to 1,300 square feet. On these were built snug little cottages, two stories high, with a nice yard at front and rear. They cost, with the land, less than $600, but were large enough to house a good-sized family comfortably and decently. The cottages were rented for $60 a year, with the agreement that if the rent were paid regularly for fifteen years, the tenant should become the absolute owner of the property. Nominally the rent was divided into two portions, $42 being regarded as rent, and the remainder as a sinking fund payment. It was also provided that if for any cause the tenant should wish to give up the house, the amount of his contributions to the sinking fund should be returned to him, with interest at three per cent, less a certain deduction for the expense of changing tenants. On the other hand he was encouraged to anticipate his payments by an allowance of five per cent interest on all sums paid before they were due.

The result of this wisely devised scheme has been most satisfactory. One hundred and seventeen houses have thus far been built, of which fifty-six have already become the property of their occupants, and twenty more will soon be transferred, although the company was only incorporated in 1871

Now what is to prevent the adoption of some such plan in this country? We have rich men, of good business judgment, who could combine and in a few years fully and comfortably house our population, and with no detriment to themselves. They need not really spend a penny of their own money, and yet they can effect a change which would do more to promote civiliza-

tion, to preserve the sacredness of the family, to break up Socialism and empty dram-shops than anything else excepting the suppression of the liquor traffic and the spread of the gospel. Let companies of citizens be formed in our cities and towns for this purpose, and let them seek also the support and sympathy of those whom they would benefit by giving their representatives a place on their Boards of Direction. These associations could open savings banks, that the people might be encouraged to set apart each week a portion of their earnings for the purchase of a home. This policy would lead to the accumulation of capital, so that money needed could ultimately be borrowed from depositors; who would also foster a more general spirit of thrift. Personally, we would rather be instrumental in starting such an enterprise as this than we would be in founding and endowing an art gallery; and then, as to its practicability, there are no more obstacles in the way than are usually found obstructing the beginning of any new movement.

We have yet more to say about coöperation; but before we express what is on our mind, we would consider some objectionable features of corporations and monopolies, especially in their relations to the welfare of Society. A "corporation," as the name denotes, is a body, and may be a monopoly, but not necessarily so, as it may have rivals in its operations and aims. We gain a clear idea of its essential nature and of several of its obnoxious characteristics from an article penned by Rev. Samuel S. Harris, LL. D., published in *Christian Thought*. One paragraph we quote, which, though long, will repay every one who reads. Referring to some significant facts, he writes:

> The first of these is that the corporation is not a natural but an artificial agency, and that its design is to countervail or avoid the operation of certain great natural laws, which, because they are natural are presumably salutary. It is a natural law that the man

who acquires capital shall administer it, his administration of it and his responsibility for such administration being of the essence of his proprietorship; and that such use of it should cease with his death. In other words, the natural law which operates to prevent the irresponsible use of capital, and the undue accumulation of it, is the law of personal responsibility for what a man has, and that it shall be distributed at his death. Now both of these natural provisions are avoided by the law of corporations. The corporation is a person that does not die. With accumulating resources and accumulating power it goes on in its way defying the law of death which arrests all personal enterprises. And not only in duration but in range, its power is extended far beyond that of any individual or combination of individuals. The natural law is that a man may wield as much power in the shape of capital as he can gain by industry or inheritance. But here is an artificial person that is allowed to wield the power which a thousand or a hundred thousand men have gained, and do this for an unlimited time, subject to no risk or chance of death or decrepitude. It is easy to see what an enormous advantage is given to capital as such by such an arrangement as this. And when to this is added the further consideration already alluded to, that this accumulated power is placed in virtually impersonal hands, that the natural proprietors and proper administrators of all this capital are emancipated by this legal device from their proper and personal responsibilities, transferring the administration of their wealth to official agents or overlookers, it is well seen that capital has been clothed by the state with exceptional privileges and enormous powers, which place the mere individual who attempts to compete with it at an immense disadvantage.

Dr. Harris has rightly said that the individual who attempts to compete with this soulless organism is at an immense disadvantage; and consequently it has been the prolific source of wretchedness to many people, and is so still. Mr. Godwin Moody has shown how difficult and next to impossible it is for the farmer to hold his own against the great corporation farms of the West. He sinks into beggary before their gigantic transactions; and one can easily picture his misery as he sees himself ruined, not by any fault of his own, but by an irresitible combination which has received its power from that government which

he has supported, and from the administration which boasts that it saved the Union. Well, we may rest assured if the land-grab system continues and if the "bonanza farms" are not suppressed, some more Union-saving will be needed before long, and these sons of the soil will be the men by whom its integrity will be imperiled. What is true of agricultural affairs is equally true of every department of commerce. The unit in the long run, and frequently the "run" is very short, succumbs to the corporation. There are, of course, instances where one man is more fertile in resources, and is more successful than several men, however compactly they may be organized. But this is not usual. The rule as a general thing works the other way. These organizations usually carry everything before them, destroying the old-time sympathy between employer and employed, and impairing the independence as well as the fortune of the private citizen. They are accused, and we think with justice, of various devices to escape bearing their proportion of taxation, such as the making of inadequate returns of their property and business to the government; and it is alleged that in many instances they use their advantages to deceive the public, and by manipulations which will not bear honest scrutiny defraud the stockholders who have no direct share in the management. And if these charges and others like them can be sustained, and that they can be, few will doubt, what tremendous power must a corporation wield when it ceases to have any competitors in its special sphere—that is, when it becomes, or is from the beginning of its existence, a monopoly.

The term "monopoly" was originally employed in English history to describe grants from the crown or from parliament, by which sole control of some particular article was given to an individual, generally as a reward for services rendered the nation or supposed to have been ren-

dered. Sir Edward Coke, however, laid it down as a principle of ancient Common Law that the king could only confer a temporary monopoly. This decision has never been overruled. Queen Elizabeth carried the royal prerogative beyond all such limitations as this, and was so lavish with her favors that some of the necessaries of life were taxed in the interest of private parties. But, after many agitations at different times, in 1623 a statute was enacted condemning monopolies, with the exception of those created by parliament or designed to protect new inventions. Since then the nearest approach to an infringement of these provisions in England is found in the extraordinary franchise granted railroads, canals, and gas and water companies. Public feeling in that kingdom is very strong in its opposition to the privileges and exemtions enjoyed by such corporations. The Continent participates in this antipathy, and in the United States there is a growing determination that monopolies shall not be permitted permanently to exist in the land. As it is, there are not really very many in our country. Of course we have some. For instance, the elevated railroads in New York may be thus classed, as they have the exclusive right to transmit passengers over prescribed routes. An ordinary surface railroad, also, has this character, when other companies are restrained from doing business along its line of travel. So in the case of the telephone, and of the various motors now claiming public attention. They are protected by patents, and until these expire the proprietors can defy all rivals. In some cities the water supply and the gas supply are by charter handed over to companies, and competition is next to impossible: these are monopolies. But of late this word has come to be somewhat modified in meaning. It is now frequently applied to corporations in which enormous aggregations of capital are invested, and which are administered by a

small board of directors. There may be organizations similar to themselves and having in view the same end; but, nevertheless, they are spoken of as monopolies, because they command immense resources before which private enterprise usually succumbs, and over which the majority or their own members have very little control. The complaint is that the concentration of these large sums of money is at once a temptation and a threat; a temptation, as it leads in many instances to a misappropriation of funds; and a threat, as it often influences unscrupulous persons to attempt the corruption of justice, and encourages the impudent assumption that politics should subserve and government policies be shaped in their interests. A few millionaires in New York and several other great centers, like Boston and Chicago, as the representatives and practical owners of railroads and telegraphs, have it in their power to derange values, to plunder their own stockholders, and to distress and impoverish their employés. The semi-monopolies of which they are the chiefs magnify the supremacy of capital, and are not altogether unlike the engines which some of them build—very dangerous to the poor creatures who happen to get under their wheels. While they are willing to pay their presidents salaries ranging from $10,000 to $20,000 a year, they imagine that in the eternal fitness of things a brakeman ought only to receive some $35 or $40 per month. Consequently they are exceedingly unpopular, and there is a widespread desire, often expressed in fierce mutterings, that they should be summarily and finally suppressed.

But how can we dispense with them? While they are the source of much mischief, they seem to be a necessary evil. Mr. Mill (*Political Economy*, Vol. II, chap. XI, §11) recommends that the extensive undertakings, which individual resources are not equal to, and which now give a color of reason to their existence, ought to be cared for

and superintended by the State. Now it is within the bounds of probability that this is the only way out of our difficulties. Government administration of the Postal Service has been eminently successful, and has in no way infringed on the rights or liberties of the citizen; and so has created some degree of sentiment favorable to its management of other gigantic interests involving the public welfare. We cannot, however, say that we are a convert to this doctrine. Still we concede that it is not like appropriating the land, and confiscating private property; neither is it offensively Communistic in character. Telegraphs, railroads, the gas and the water supplies, also, could be provided and directed by the State, as the postoffice is, without subverting individual rights or seriously affecting the present order of things. This much may be said in support of the scheme, and consequently we do not hold ourselves bound by our devotion to the American idea of liberty to permanently oppose it. But at present it does not approve itself to our judgment. We dread being over-governed. Other plans should be essayed before this one is resorted to. We are strengthened in this opinion by what Mr. Mill himself has written in the chapter referred to; for while he there recommends what we oppose, he very forcibly presents the objections which have largely determined our own views on the subject. Read this passage:

> The true reasons in favor of leaving voluntarily to associations all such things as they are competent to perform, would exist in equal strength if it were certain that the work itself would be as well or better done by public officers. These reasons have been already pointed out: the mischief of overloading the chief functionaries of Government with demands on their attention, and diverting them from duties which they alone can discharge, to objects which can be sufficiently well attained without them: the danger of unnecessarily swelling the direct power and indirect influence of Government, and

multiplying occasions of collision between its agents and private citizens; and the still greater inexpediency of concentrating in a dominant bureaucracy, all the skill and experience in the management of large interests, and all the power of organized action, existing in the community; a practice which keeps the citizens in a relation to the Government like that of children to their guardians and is a main cause of the inferior capacity for political life which has hitherto characterized the overgoverned countries of the Continent, whether with or without the forms of representative government.

Moreover, in confirmation of our suspicions relative to the advisability and value of the Communal remedy, we have the following account of its action in France, taken from the *Dictionnaire de Economic Politique:*

In France the initiative and direction of all these works (*i. e.*, harbors, internal navigations, roads, bridges, railways) belong to the central authority, acting by means of a numerous and expensive body, the engineers of roads and bridges ("ingenieurs des ponts et chaussées"). Most of the great channels of communication are established at the cost of the public, according to the schemes or designs of these engineering officials; the schemes which are started independently of them are subjected to their control; and it scarcely ever happens that such schemes are accepted by the authorities against their advice. The result of this régime is, that in respect of works of this character the spirit of enterprise is wholly discouraged, and that scarcely anything is accomplished except at the instance and by the impulse of the body of official engineers, an impulse which, for reasons which we have given under the title "Fonctionaries," is incomparably less powerful and less fertile than that of free industry. Thus, none of the great improvements in artificial channels of communication, or in means of transport which have been introduced within the last fifty years, have originated in France—macadamization of roads, railroads, locomotives, suspension bridges, steamboats, etc., all are the work of the free and independent engineers of England or America. The monopoly of our official engineers is as little adapted to improve and utilize inventions as to start them. And although our country is one of those in which industry is most highly developed, and in which a multiplicity of the most perfect channels of communication—*e. g.* of railways—is the most necessary, we have remained in this respect far behind the United States, England, Belgium, etc. A further result of the French

system is that the channels of communication are distributed over the country without any real proportion to the wants of its several districts, and that their expense, instead of being supported, as in England, by tolls levied on those who use them, and in proportion to the use they make of them, falls, without reference to the service rendered, on all contributors alike.

From these extracts we gather that the plan advocated by Mr. Mill is not without serious drawbacks, and that the United States had better pause and deliberate before they commit themselves to its adoption.

It seems to us that some less drastic measures can be devised; and that it must be possible to provide against the most flagrant evils of corporations, and prevent the increase of monopolies, without rendering the country liable to the injury which is being wrought in France. Mr. David Dudley Field agrees with us in this opinion, and in a paper on the subject has made several important suggestions. We give our readers the benefit of his principal thought, and shall make it the introduction to some reflections in the same direction. He says:

> For our times and our wants wise and comprehensive legislation is needed. What it should be, this is not the place to discuss. The subject is too large for a single paper. But one thing is certain: the State should keep and exercise control over every corporate franchise. A franchise is a privilege that the possessor enjoys beyond the rest of the citizens. For that reason it should never be irrevocable. Equality of rights is the foundation of republican government, and whenever, for any reason, some out of the body of citizens are invested with peculiar privileges, these should be revocable at all times, saving such guarantees as the inviolability of property requires. In other words, it should be a cardinal maxim that there can be no private property in privilege. It is enough here to say that I think it possible to protect the rights of the State, and at the same time the rights of the citizen who has received the grant of a franchise and under it has invested his property.

We concur in this view; but in our judgment the recommendation does not go far enough. It is too conserv-

ative. As corporations are creatures of law, and as it is mischievous in various respects for one man or a very few men to own enough stock to make them monopolists and autocrats, we would have the State limit the amount that may legally be held by an individual. Suppose the limit prescribed were such that to render the organization a fact the shares would have to be widely distributed; then no person would be able, without fraud, to obtain control of a sufficient number so as to "corner" the rest; and the concern could not be administered in the interest of, and for the benefit of, a selfish and conscienceless clique. It may be said that capital would not seek investment on any such terms. We are not so sure of that. Why should it not? It would be as safe as it is now, the difference being only that it would be unable to realize the enormous profits which are gained under the present loose system. But if millionaires stood back the people would not; and they would be glad to trust their savings to corporations which could never become the helpless prey of a few unscrupulous men. Moreover, it would be an advantage to the nation for the industrial classes to be represented in railroad, telegraph and other great companies. Such representation would be fatal to the progress of Socialism, and would go far toward creating a spirit of contentment. But in addition to this restriction, we would have the issuing and reissuing of stocks and bonds under the direct surveillance of Government; and we would have the robbing of the original shareholders, now so common, that a shrewd lot of manipulators may be enriched, a criminal proceeding punishable in the penitentiary. In other words instead of the State undertaking to carry out every vast enterprise which heretofore has been managed by combinations of citizens, let her see to it that such charters are granted to corporations as will prevent them ever becoming the private property of one or

two wealthy schemers, and let her energetically compel them to fulfill the compact they have entered into. Then securities of almost every description, usually regarded as too insecure for permanent investment, and which are treated now mainly as a convenient speculative medium, would be worth possessing. As it is these printed bits of paper, valued on their face away up in the millions, have been so "doctored" and so tampered with that the people are suspicious of them, and knowing that "kings of the board" and "princes of the street" think it a fine thing "to scoop in the boys," they turn from them with fear and detestation. Of course the legislation we propose would seriously interfere with the operations of the Stock Exchange. But this would be no real loss to the country. It would curtail gambling, and would force brokers to sell only what they really owned. This would be no grievous affliction, as it would neither impair prosperity nor diminish honesty. To the contrary, it would increase both. And finally, the conditions we have defined would deprive gentlemen of the privilege of carrying New York Central railroads and Western Union telegraphs in their pockets; would deliver multitudes from being puppets in the hands of monopolists; and in connection with the land legislation already recommended in this volume, would put an end to monopolies themselves.

Mr. Field, in the *North American Review* (May, 1885), has favored the public with the statement of a theory touching the subject under consideration which we believe is not altogether visionary, and which very fittingly supplements what we have already quoted from his pen. This is what he proposes:

> Is there any reason why corporations created for profit that heretofore have been aggregations of capital only, should not be made aggregations of capital and labor, or, to speak more accurately, representatives of capital and labor? Let us suppose a manufacturing

corporation to be formed with a view of giving to all the persons employed an interest in the profits of the establishment. Divide the nominal capital into shares of small amount, some of them payable in labor to be contributed; give to the workman credit for a part of his wages, and pay him the rest for his daily living. Is this a wild scheme? Let us see.

The plan supposes a cash capital sufficient to plant and stock the establishment, and a credit capital, payable in labor, sufficient to work it. The difference between such a plan and the present is, that the latter requires a capital payable in cash or its equivalent in other property; whereas the plan suggested requires also a credit capital payable in labor. As the business goes on now, the laborer has no interest in the capital; he works for wages fixed between him and his employer, upon a bargain in which there is no equality between the parties, in which one is to a greater or less degree in the power of the other, or at least stands in such a relation of dependence as is incompatible with that sense of self-respect, that pride of manhood, which should be the patrimony of every American citizen. Why may not the two be made to stand in the relation of equal dependence and mutual respect? Would not both be better off for the new relation? The capitalist shareholder would know that every blow of the workman was given in the interest of both, and the workman would know that every good bargain of the capitalist tended to the increase of his daily bread and the advancement of his family.

Whether Mr. Field has given the best method for the carrying out of this scheme is open to question; but there can be no doubt that the thought expressed is of the highest value. The idea that "labor," which has mitigated the harshnesss of its lot by coöperation in its own ranks, should now gain benefits through the formation of an alliance with its ancient enemy "capital," is at once unique and full of promise. We believe in it; for we have seen that the divorce of these two mighty factors in social progress has been a source of perpetual mischief. They who have been separated should be joined together. The hostile camps that have been frowning at each other this long while should be broken up, and the twin armies of civilization be merged and become one. Henceforth

the coöperation, not of labor with labor only, or of capital with capital exclusively, but of labor with capital and of capital with labor, should be our aim. When such coöperation as this is reached, then competition will be moderated and restrained without being destroyed; and then monopoly will be abolished without suspending the legitimate workings of corporations. And then the hopes of Mr. Mill, which he has stated with vigorous distinctness, will be in a fair way of fulfillment; for he tells us that he looks for the time to come when in some way or other

> both private capitalists and associations will gradually find it necessary to make the entire body of laborers participants in profits. Eventually, and perhaps in a less remote future than may be supposed, we may, through the coöperative principle, see our way to a change in society which would combine the freedom and independence of the individual with the moral, intellectual and economical advantages of aggregate production; and which, without violence or spoliation, or even any sudden disturbance of existing habits and expectations, would realize, at least in the industrial department, the best aspirations of the democratic spirit, by putting an end to the division of society into the industrious and the idle, and effacing all social distinctions but those fairly earned by personal services and exertions.

There is another and supreme cause of suffering in Society, one that maddens and murders, and that afflicts with unlimited and unspeakable anguish, which must be suppressed if humanity is ever to see brighter days. We refer to VICE, or more accurately, the Vices which have such vigorous growth in the hot-bed of modern life. These produce more wretchedness and despair than all other enemies of man's happiness combined. Were the social systems of our most enlightened reformers realizable and realized, the survival of these fearful curses would frustrate and blight their benevolent operations. Vice is the monster of monsters, and it is useless to talk about measures of relief as long as it is permitted to destroy.

It is the terrible Python springing from mud and wallowing and writhing in malodorous floods; it is the real Minotaurus greedily devouring our young men and women; it is the serpent-haired Medusa, whose petrifying fascinations, in spite of the sword-thrusts of Perseus, convert the heart into a stone; it is the black Vulcan, forging bolts of deadly retaliation for the thunder-dealing hand of Jupiter; it is the fanciful but consuming Chimæra, vomiting flames and filling the undying soul with fires of remorse; yea, it is the ferryman, Charon, grimly rowing reveler and *roué*, who are dead while they live, across the gloomy Styx; and finally it is the infernal domain itself, the very Tartarus of Perdition, where, according to Virgil, only the exceptionally depraved are punished. Governments have more to dread from its influence than from the wildest and silliest of political heresies. The records of history show that immoralities have had more to do with the decline of empires, the decay of cities, and the convulsions of states than the entire brood of revolutionists, anarchists and dynamiters. The overthrow of Greece and Rome was due rather to the emasculating tendencies of profligacy, than to the power of arms or the mistakes of diplomacy. Men will doubtless sneer at these ill-omened words. They have often done so. The handwriting on the wall rarely interrupts the lascivious debauch. Dark prophets of inevitable retribution may cast their shadows over the Paphian orgy unheeded, as the monster-figures on Vesuvius, which warned Pompeii of its impending disaster, were idly ridiculed:

> Man only mocks the peril. Man alone
> Defies the sulphurous flame, the warning groan,
> While instinct, humbler guardian, wakes and saves,
> Proud reason sleeps nor knows the doom it braves.

But this sad theme is too vast and too closely related to every vital interest of Society for us to attempt its discus-

sion here, or otherwise than by itself. We have merely introduced it in this connection to complete the circle of evil agencies which are responsible for the moans and sobs of our afflicted age, not to explore its darkness or confront its horrors. That repulsive task will be undertaken in the following chapter.

Many persons rely almost exclusively on charity as the means best suited to diminish and heal the sorrows of mankind. Legislative remedies they profess to have no confidence in; and reforms in business methods they smile at as impracticable. They would in no wise disturb the present order and if it presses hard on some classes they would by princely gifts prevent excessive chafing. The fact is, they find it easier to act benevolently than justly; and would rather succor the unfortunate than compensate adequately the industrious. Charity makes multitudes their dependents, diverts the public mind, and renders it easier for fraud and trickery to succeed. We dare not trust its offices. They are not equal to the work its devotees imagine they can perform. Suffering never has been and never will be effaced by their ministry. There will, doubtless, always be cases where no other agency can bring deliverance, and where charity may safely be encouraged. We cannot dispense with its help; but at best, this help affords only a temporary relief. The poor, we are told, we shall ever have with us. There will, very likely, always be orphan children, or children whose lot is more deplorable, having vicious parents; and widows whose meager earnings cannot comfortably provide for their fatherless families; and young girls suddenly thrown out of employment, without friends to aid, driven to starvation or tempted to shame; and laboring men, and men pursuing professional careers, prostrated by disease, and unable to meet their increased expenses; and aged people whose means of support departed with their strength; and people perma-

nently disabled by wounds, the loss of the faculties, or by the bitter inheritance of blindness, deafness and dumbness; and still others who are the victims of cruel oppression and wrong. These may fairly claim the sympathy and the pecuniary assistance of the rich, and assistance may usually be extended without detriment to them or to Society. But at the same time let not too much reliance be placed on these means. Remember that beggary, and with it social misery, has never been diminished, but has rather increased in proportion as money given has taken the place of money earned. The Roman emperors distributed corn and oil to their subjects instead of stimulating industry. The Justices of Berks, in England, 1795, supplemented the wages of workmen with an allowance from the parish funds, instead of influencing their employers to pay them a fairer remuneration. All parties would have been better off if they had reversed their method. What would have been lost in wages would have been saved in taxation, and the operatives would have preserved their self-respect, and would have rendered better service. The wretched policy they preferred was dominant in England until 1860–69, and at that date there were some 150,000 paupers in London. America has been peculiarly prodigal in its so-called benefactions. We do not believe any country surpasses her in princely liberality to the needy. Now a Drexel distributes over $20,000 a year among the unfortunate, then a Stuart denotes $50,000 for a lodging house to shelter homeless boys; and in all of our cities enormous sums are lavished on those who are in adversity. Nor do we question but that a vast amount of good has been accomplished by these philanthropic offerings; neither do we deny that in many instances they have been deserved; yet the fact stares us in the face that the poverty and misery of Society have not been perceptibly decreased. Perhaps the explanation of this remarkable and discour-

aging failure is not difficult to discover. Robert Treat Paine quotes a witty bishop as saying "If you pay a man to work, he'll work, if you pay him to beg, he'll beg"; and refers to a Lacedemonian who answered a mendicant, "If I should give thee anything I should but make thee a greater beggar; for he who first gave to thee made thee idle, and so determined thee to this base way of living." He likewise tells the story of a woman who on passing one who was seeking alms heard him utter with much intensity, "I must then, I will do it! I *will* do it!" Fearing that he was about to do something desperate she paused, and having filled his hand with money, inquired what it was he proposed attempting in his rashness. He replied, "But for your timely assistance I had almost resolved to go to work." Thus the facility with which he obtained cash only confirmed him in his idleness and shiftlessness.

Excessive, indiscriminate charity breeds pauperism. It creates an immense army of good-for-nothings, loungers, tramps and tipplers. They perceive that honest toil is not as handsomely rewarded as impudent indigence; and it is not surprising that multitudes should choose the role of the beggar in preference to that of the workman. In these circumstances mendicancy naturally becomes one of the fine arts; and Mr. Paine says that he saw an advertisement of a Professor Lazarus Rooney proposing to teach it in six lessons: but whether taught or not, it has numerous adepts, who by shameless humbuggery impose on every large community. Nor would we care so much about their "spoiling the Egyptians" were it not that their despicable conduct degrades themselves and their families, promotes meanness and deceit, deepens filthiness and squalor, renders them unfit for manly occupations, and thus inevitably extends the area of human wretchedness. Charity, then, is by no means a cure-all; it may cover sin,

but it does not heal Society. It cannot be entirely dispensed with; but neither can it be exclusively relied on. While it is important in its place, that place is neither as large nor as commanding as some persons suppose. What is immeasurably of more importance and of more value, and has in it more of medicinal virtue to purge destitution, distress and despair from the land, is Justice. Just masters, just treatment, just wages, will do more to abate suffering than all the alms-giving in the world. Is it said that charity binds up the broken heart, clothes the naked, feeds the hungry, houses the homeless? True; but we reply, that justice keeps hearts from being broken, and saves the body from hunger, nakedness and exposure. Why, there is more real charity in justice than there is charity in charity when justice is ignored. The one is simply a remedy, and a bungling, inadequate remedy at that; while the other is a preventive, and a very potent and efficacious preventive it is. The *London Quarterly Review* (1872) says that the sums annually distributed in the metropolis of England among the poor and the afflicted, or that are expended on their behalf, would suffice to extinguish destitution were they judiciously employed. They amount to the enormous total of seven millions and a half sterling; enough, assuming that one-eighth of the population, or 400,000 persons, are wholly dependent on their fellow-citizens, to allow eighty-five pounds per annum to every such family for sustenance and education. "Yet," continues the same authority, "the evils against which all these vast resources are provided or can be directed, go on increasing from year to year. In this, as in so many other matters, we endure so much evil and do so little good, because we manage so badly, and are so constantly sailing on the wrong tack." But what, from this showing, must be the right tack, and the one most advantageous to Society? Justice! We cannot conceive of any other; and

no other leads to the port of safety. That alone can bring capital and labor together on terms of mutual respect; that alone can awaken trust and confidence where suspicion now prevails; that alone can inspire real gratitude and faithfulness, and that alone can permanently alleviate sorrow, for that alone lays the ax at its root. We, therefore, again declare our firm belief that those persons who expect charity to assuage and exterminate the woes of mankind are self-deceived or are trying to deceive others. Their gospel is an illusion and a snare, and is a pithless, nerveless thing; and at best is only a weak simulation of that other gospel, the one called "everlasting," which has back of it the granite-like principles of Sinai. What we supremely need is a revival of justice. As Carlyle says:

> Justice, Justice: woe betides us everywhere when for this reason or for that, we fail to do justice! No beneficence, benevolence, or other virtuous contribution will make good the want. And in what a rate of terrible geometrical progression, far beyond *our* poor computation, any act of Injustice once done by us grows; rooting itself ever anew, spreading ever anew, like a banyan-tree,—blasting all life under it, for it is a poison-tree! There is but one thing needed for the world; but that one is indispensable. Justice, Justice, in the name of Heaven; give us Justice, and we live; give us only counterfeits of it, or succedanea for it, and we die!

To all of which we respond, amen and amen!

Auerbach in one of his novels relates the story of a lost soul. He represents a woman in Perdition, who craves from St. Peter permission to revisit her former haunts on earth that she may see her lover for a few moments, and have the satisfaction of witnessing his passionate sorrow for her death. Peter urges her not to insist on her request; but she persists in her petition, and promises if it is granted, henceforward to accept uncomplainingly her doom. She receives her liberty, hastens to earth, and finds that her Paul is comforting himself with the love of another woman. The poor soul is overwhelmed

with an anguish unlike anything experienced before; she mutely returns to her place in Hell, and says that she is now content to endure the worst. Peter feels deeply her wretchedness caused by the sight of earthly forgetfulness, and declaring that she had tasted an eternity of misery in contemplating for a moment her lover's oblivion to her past devotion, he announces that her punishment is complete and her admission into heaven gained. This pathetic invention suggests two thoughts: the measureless capacity of human nature for suffering; and the overruling providence of God in suffering itself. He enables the race to endure it. He sanctifies it, and when it has not resulted from vicious conduct, He sees that it does not lose its reward. The latter of these two thoughts is closely allied to the subject of this paper. Ruskin tells us that the marble "which men have been cutting into slabs for thousands of years to ornament their principal buildings with," has been branded by "earth's agonies," and that its "flaming zone and purple vein" show "signs of ancient torture." Figure this of what pain and agony may do for mankind, if not invited by iniquity, and if graciously softened by the sweet consciousness of Divine sympathy. In the fires the heart may be made stronger, the principles firmer, and the motives purer. This, however, is only true of the multitude of cases implied throughout this discussion, where calamities overtake the virtuous, and where wretchedness is the result of oppressions, selfishness and social blunders. Hence it is that religion is indispensable. It is this that ameliorates many hardships, that lightens many burdens, that reconciles men to many losses, and that, to some extent, counteracts the degrading tendency of extreme privation. Sad indeed, then, must be the day when any nation thrusts aside its healing ministry. Lord Macaulay writes as truly as he does eloquently, when he says, "to discountenance that religion which

has done so much to promote justice, and mercy, and freedom, and arts and sciences, and good government, and domestic happiness, which has struck off the chains of the slave, which has mitigated the horrors of war, which has raised women from playthings and servants into companions and friends, is to commit high treason against humanity and civilization." And yet infidelity, which Webster characterized as "low, ribald and vulgar," and which he denounced as tending "to destroy the very foundation and framework of society," sneers at the influence of Christianity and proposes its overthrow in the interest of happiness and progress. To all who are of this way of thinking we commend the vigorous protest of Victor Hugo: "When Lazarus comes to believe that there is no other and better world for the redress of the inequalities of this, he will cease to lie at the rich man's gate; he will force his way into the rich man's house." To them also we commend this warning from the pen of a recent writer: "Society needs the background of the Infinite to insure its stability, and the government which helps men to regard themselves as a clever kind of beasts, and destined to perish as the beasts do, is beating down the barriers of its own safety, and bringing in the floods of its own destruction." Were religion overborne and extirpated, not only would the motives which now impel us to help one another be effaced, but our sufferings would be actually intensified and multiplied by obscuring every reason for their endurance, and quenching every hope of their ultimate transformation into blessings. Recall these lines by Charlotte Brontë:

> I've heard of heaven—I would believe:
> For if this earth indeed be all,
> Who longest lives may deepest grieve;
> Most blest, whom sorrows soonest call,

Oh! leaving disappointment here,
Will man find hope on yonder coast?
Hope which on earth shines never clear,
And oft in clouds is wholly lost.

* * * * * *

If so, endure my weary frame;
And when thy anguish strikes too deep,
And when all troubled burns life's flame,
Think of the quiet final sleep;
Think of the glorious waking hour,
Which will not dawn on grief and tears,
But on a ransomed spirit's power,
Certain and free from mortal fears.

These are human feelings which the poetess describes. We need the great faith of life beyond the grave "to make us brave," brave to endure the sufferings and brave to antagonize the wrongs, which everywhere trample beneath their feet the fairest hopes, the purest aspirations and the sweetest joys.

During the battle of Regillus, as the poet recounts, the twin brothers, Castor and Pollux, appeared on behalf of the Romans, and wherever they moved on that eventful day victory crowned the cause they had espoused:

So like they were no mortal
Might one from other know;
White as snow their armor was,
Their steeds were white as snow;
Never on earthly anvil
Did such rare armor gleam,
And never did such gallant steeds
Drink of an earthly stream.

So, likewise, when the Roman sailors in stress of storm beheld two luminous flames playing about the masts of their ships, they called them Castor and Pollux, and regarded them as the harbingers of coming calm. Hence Horace sang:

But when the sons of Leda shed
Their star-lamps on the vessel's head,
The storm-winds cease, the troubled spray
Falls from the rocks, clouds flee away,
And on the bosom of the deep
In peace the angry billows sleep.

Can it be that humanity has no twin brothers to cheer it as it strives against the tyranny of might and the tears of misery? Are there no lights to guide when the night is dark and the stars are quenched? Fights the sufferer the battle alone, plunges he through tempestuous seas, without an Omnipotent hand on the rudder to safely make the haven? No; the race has not been so abandoned by the merciful Father. He has sent into the world and into our hearts the great twin belief—PROVIDENCE and IMMORTALITY—and where these grand truths reign supreme, there the warfare is not without its victories, nor the troubled voyage without its beacons, nor Society without hope of a blissful calm, where tribulations shall subside, or be but as the gentle ripples on an inland sea.

V.

THE VICES OF SOCIETY.

Truly, lady, I am tolerably drunk:
* * * Drink's a god.
How else did that old doting driveler
Kratinos foil me, match my masterpiece
The "Clouds"? I swallowed cloud distillment—dew
Undimmed by any grape blush, knit my brow
And gnawed my style and laughed my learnedest;
While he worked at his "willow-wicker-flask,"
Swigging at that same flask, by which he swore,
Till, sing and empty, sing and fill again,
Somehow result was—what it should not be.
* * * Did you only know
What happened! Little wonder I am drunk.
* * * * * * * * * *
One of these women that abound in Rome,
Whose needs oblige them eke out one poor trade
By another vile one; her ostensible work
Was washing clothes, out in the open air,
At the cistern by Citorio; but true trade—
Whispering to idlers when they stopped and praised
The ankle she let liberally shine
In kneeling at the slab by the fountain side.
Violante, now, had seen this woman wash,
Noticed and envied her propitious shape,
Tracked her home to her house-top, noted, too,
And was now come to tempt her and propose
A bargain far more shameful than the first
Which trafficked her virginity away
For a melon and three pauls at twelve years old.

—*Robert Browning.*

RUSKIN, in his *Ethics of the Dust*, describes a wonderful valley of diamonds. It lies high up among the hills, as high as the clouds, and is often full of them. The

entrance is very wide, under a steep rock, and leads to an uneven road with thickets of bramble, whose blossoms are silver and whose clusters are rubies, and with grapes that taste like gall, and berries that stain like blood growing on either side. Then the grass is strewn with glittering dust, and the trees have twisted bows as though they were in pain; and serpents, which have fine crimson crests and which sing enchantingly, are in the forests; and human beings who venture near them are in danger of taking on their nature and of being changed into their likeness. Fire-flies are there which burn as real sparks do; and a labyrinth perplexes and involves the wanderer, made of great cliffs of dead gold and of massy ledges of ice, which often fall thundering down, destroying and burying all who unhappily are in their desolating pathway. To the artist-critic this is a vision of our Mammon age; to us it is a picture of vice with its attractions and perils. Vice like a huge valley, lies among the mountains of Society, sometimes high up among the respectable classes; and frequently it is filled with hazy, fleecy notions regarding right and wrong which betray the unsuspecting to their ruin. Allurements are also there. It is gilded and lighted, decorated and beautified; but the juice from its vines is poisonous, and the stains from its Dead-sea fruit are ineffacable. Drunkenness, gambling and profligacy are its three great serpents, which assume endless forms and appear in endless broods, and which transform their victims into their own green and slimy image. Whoever enters this valley finds it difficult to escape. The farther it is traversed the more tortuous and cheerless the road becomes; and accumulated transgressions rise into giant peaks, blocking the avenues to freedom, and sometimes, toppling with their own weight, crush into indistinguishable death the misguided wretches who have sought unhallowed pleasures.

These evils the Bible uniformly denounces, and seeks in every way to deliver mankind from their thraldom. "Woe unto them," exclaims Isaiah, "that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink, that continue until night till wine inflame them!" "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink." An apostle sums up the array of enemies that are to be reprobated in these words: "The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like"; and Peter gives a final touch to their loathsomeness when, referring to those who practice them, he adds: "They count it pleasure to riot in the daytime; their eyes are full of adultery, and they cannot cease from sin. When they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through much wantonness those that were clean escaped from them who live in error." It is happened unto them according to the true proverb: "The dog is turned to his own vomit again, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." Further, the same writer elsewhere exposes a common and fatal error by which thousands are deceived. They fret against the restraints of virtue, and avow themselves anxious to enjoy perfect liberty. But mark their folly. They merely change mastery. The restraints of wholesome law they cast aside only to become servants, slaves to profligacy. There is in the apostle's language a world of sarcasm, scathing rebuke, and holy indignation. "They promise them"—those to whom they speak and whom they would seduce, what they at first promised themselves—"liberty"; but their persuasive representations are absurd and false, for "they themselves are the slaves of corruption." Very few persons realize the terrible coercion there is in their acts. Lavalette declares

that the history of human passion teaches the difficulty which even the best men have had in stopping when once they had set out on the road to ruin. Once evil is admitted into the sanctuary of the soul, it requires more than a whip with small cords to drive it out. Dr. Johnson said quaintly but wisely: "I can abstain; I cannot be moderate." He evidently felt what Coventry Patmore versifies in the lines:

> How easy to keep free from sin!
> How hard that freedom to recall!
> For dreadful truth it is, that men
> Forget the heavens from which they fall.

And what is true of individuals is as true of Society as a whole. We know that throughout the civilized world the question is, How can Society be saved from its vices? Having obtained rootage in its soil, developing out of its very existence, they have spread themselves over its surface until at times they threaten the extirpation of virtue and the subversion of civil government. They extend in all directions. We hear of their prevalence in the highest court circles of Europe and among the most fashionable coteries of America, as well as among the thoughtless, reckless and criminal classes of both continents. They have obtained so powerful a hold on all communities, have such vast money interests at stake, have so many reputations at their mercy, that they not infrequently defy justice, and ridicule the rebukes of the press and the pulpit alike. In other words, they practically obtain mastery and rule with a rod of iron; and, doing so in the name of personal liberty, they succeed in blinding officers of the law, and even many well informed people, to the brutal bondage and measureless suffering which they entail.

To break this terrible yoke, these deceptive, destroying, devilish vices must be exposed· the mask must be torn from their hideous features; the disguises must be stripped

from their festering, putrid bodies: and all friends of social regeneration must be made to realize that for the sake of these fierce and terrible Harpies, living in an atmosphere of filth and stench, and contaminating, befouling and deforming everything and every one they touch, national prosperity is continually jeopardized, and human sufferings are indefinitely multiplied; and that these bitter results never can be averted until their monstrous causes are exterminated.

We have incidentally referred to their prevalence in our times; but this is a matter of sufficient gravity to call for more extended notice. Rhetorical extravagance is so common that any extraordinary statement has to be presented with due regard for facts and figures, if it would succeed in making an impression favorable to its truthfulness on the public mind. The habit of indulging in assertions without any adequate effort to avoid exaggeration, or to array in their support sufficient proof, has indisposed a large number of persons to believe what is entirely credible and almost indisputable. Thus when we refer to licentiousness in such terms as we have already employed, it is not unnatural that some excellent people should look upon us as an inexcusable slanderer of this generation. Such, however, is not the case. The trouble is, these obstinately optimistic critics do not study the situation; and possibly their position in life preserves them from contact with the dissoluteness of the age; and hence they suppose that they who paint in gloomy colors its dissipations are actuated by a fanatical spirit. Were they to look at things just as they are, and do so long enough, their opinion would undergo a change. We, therefore, feel that they need to have presented to them a thoroughly sustained conception of our moral condition, that like good sailors, they may take their bearings before they commit themselves to any final and defi-

nite course of action. This is all the more important as there are some writers who incline to extremer views than we are prepared to advocate, and we have no desire to be identified with them. From various sources we hear the cry, that the people were never as immoral as now, and that we are inevitably going from bad to worse; and when any one talks or writes on the real extent of vice he is in danger of being classed with this unconvertible pessimistic party. But this is not our attitude. We believe in moral progress; and if the race is no purer and holier because of the ministry of Christ, we confess that we see no real cause for his advent, and no particular advantages proceeding from it, at least as far as this world is concerned. Moreover, it is a poor comment on the labors of our temperance societies for one hundred years to declare that drunkenness and every kind of villainy are on the increase. If this is all we have to chronicle, if the earnest workers have wrought in vain, why it hardly seems worth while to keep up the farcical conflict. We admit that we may be passing through one of those retrogressive movements, of which we wrote when discussing "Progress," which ultimately will promote a fresh and further advance in the right direction. We do not, however, care to argue this point, nor is it necessary for us to institute a fresh comparison between the moral obliquity of other generations and our own. What we especially desire to point out, is the exact—as far as ascertainable—proportions of vice, and the number of its votaries and victims. In doing this, we fear the results will bring us very close to Pessimism; but assuredly not so close as to extinguish the hope we cherish in the ultimate emancipation of the race from unhallowed passions and soul-destroying pleasures.

Let us begin with intemperance, though an exhibit of its bloated, fiery features will necessarily reveal other

horrid, blotched and pimpled faces. The following parliamentary paper recently published contains the substance of reports from her majesty's diplomatic agents on the continent regarding the consumptions of intoxicants in the various countries to which they are accredited. We give an extract from the London *Times*, as reprinted in the Chicago *Tribune:*

Consul-General Oppenheimer estimates, with regard to Germany, that in the distilleries of the Empire in 1875 and 1876 at least 200,000,000 liters of pure alcohol were produced for mere consumption—or, in round numbers, six litres per head of the population. Reckoning the male population over fifteen years of age at 30 per cent this would give a yearly consumption of twenty litres of pure alcohol per head, or fifty litres of ordinary schnapps. By the year 1880 the quantity had increased to seventy-one litres yearly per head. The consumption of spirits in North Germany is very great; and out of a yearly average of 4,450 suicides in Prussia for five years, 508 have been due to dipsomania and delirium tremens. The percentage of suicides among males due to alcohol was 13.40, whereas among females it was only 2. With regard to fatal accidents also a large number of them were attributable to drunkenness. Similar statistics were furnished in connection with the lunatic asylums. Taking 3,106 cases yearly treated in the general hospitals for dipsomania, 690 cases of delirium tremens in the lunatic asylums, 597 private dipsomaniacs, 508 suicides, and 311 drunkards accidentally killed, there is a total of 5,212 cases yearly of alcoholism in a fatal form. The Prussian States alone showed 1,921 men and 95 women treated yearly for delirium tremens. It appears that seven-tenths of those suffering from alcohol were in the prime of life—that is, between twenty and fifty years of age,

In Sweden and Norway the consumption of spirits has been declining for some years past, but in Denmark the evil of spirit-drinking has reached a terrible pitch. The number of drunkards who have committed suicide has risen in thirty years from one-seventh to one-third; while, among the arrests, 56 per cent were cases of drunkenness, and adding to these 18 per cent among prisoners for other offenses, there is a grand total of 74 per cent, or three-fourths of all those taken into custody, for crimes committed under the influence of drink.

In Holland the number of houses for the sale of drink was not less than 45,000 in 1878, so that in a population of 4,000,000 there was a drink shop for every ninety inhabitants, including women and children. But, owing to the exertions of a portion of the community the legislature passed a restrictive law in 1881, with the result that in the course of one year the drink shops decreased from 45,000 to 33,000.

Belgium affords incontestably the worst statistics in regard to the consumption of alcoholic liquors. In less than half a century the use of spiritous liquors has more than trebled itself in that country, while the population has only advanced from 3,500,000 to 5,500,000. The use of spirits increased 66 per cent between 1851 and 1881, and of beer increased during the same period 15.75 per cent. The consumption of spirits, wine and beer for 1881 amounted in value to 475,000,000 francs. Although the country is so small, it contained in 1880 no fewer than 125,000 places devoted to the sale of intoxicating liquors. There was a public house on the average for every twelve or thirteen grown up males. The suicides rose from fifty-four per 1,000,000 inhabitants in 1848 to eighty in 1880. The lunatics advanced from 720 per 1,000,000 inhabitants in 1846 to 1,470 in 1881. The inspector general of Belgian prisons reports that four-fifths of the crime and social misery during the last quarter of a century has been directly attributable to intemperance.

In France the sad effects of drunkenness once witnessed have been considerably lessened by the passing of a salutary act. In 1875 the number punished for open drunkenness was 98,000 but by 1880 they had fallen to 60,000.

Switzerland exhibits an unsatisfactory increase in the drink traffic. Between 1870 and 1880 the population advanced 6.5 per cent, but the public houses increased by as much as 22 per cent. Austria furnishes a similar condition of things. In 1880 there were in Vienna alone, 1,624 drink houses, and 6,103 persons were in that year arrested for being drunk,

The writer of this article just quoted brings to our notice the deplorable condition of the Swiss; and another sends to London a more fearful picture of intemperance among the hardy sons of the lakes and hills than the first had space to paint.

However temperate, frugal and industrious the Switzers may once have been, they are now fast degenerating into a race of drunk-

ards. The subject is being considered by the federal government with a view to securing restrictive legislation by the national assembly. It appears that this sudden and rapid increase of intemperance among the Swiss people only dates back to 1874. Prior to that year the Cantons possessed power to regulate the traffic in drink. Then licenses were high and minute restrictive regulations were placed upon the traffic. No public house for the sale of liquor could be opened in the neighborhood of a church, school or public institution of any kind. All such places had to be closed the greater part of every Sunday, and at a certain hour each evening, and penalties were provided against furnishing drinks to minors or permitting them to frequent places where liquor was exposed for sale. By an amendment to the federal constitution all this was changed, and the right to sell alcoholic beverages was made as free as their right to sell milk or any article of provision. As a result, drinking houses multiplied, and the correspondent shows that while the population only increased six per cent in a given time, the taverns increased twenty-two per cent. He says, taking the whole country into account, there is one tavern to every 130 inhabitants, and that, deducting the women and children and the sick, there is one drinking place to every thirty persons. In Geneva, and many other towns, grocers and confectioners vend wine and spirits, and in this manner the means of spreading intemperance are multiplied. A bottle of common brandy, he says, costs about twenty cents, and judging from the effects produced, the liquor must be of the vilest character.

It is interesting to observe from these extracts that drinking in Europe is not everywhere on the increase, and that where it had gained headway there is a local reason, as in the case of the Swiss. Yet we must all admit the picture is black enough. Our own country is as bad as the others in its disgusting thirst, as the appended summary from the *Inter-Ocean*, Chicago, proves:

In 1881 there was distilled in the United States 117,728,150 gallons—over two and one-third gallons of brandy, gin and whisky for every man, woman and child, and there were brewed 13,347,110 barrels, or 413,760,410 gallons of beer—over eight gallons to every one of the population. And the customs duties for the year ending June 30, 1881, on imported spirits amounted to $6,469,643. In addition, there were the native wines and also the unlimited quantities of

whisky and beer upon which the government had not been able to collect revenue. There were in July, 1881, 4,112 wholesale dealers in distilled liquors and 170,640 retail dealers, and in 1880, 2,065 wholesale dealers in fermented liquors, and one retail dealer to every 270 souls. In the first district of Illinois—Cook, Du Page and Lake counties—there was one dealer to every 130 people. But to the saloons paying tribute to the government there must be added the unlicensed places numerous in every city. Leaving out the women and children and those who do not drink, the average to each saloon in Chicago is twenty-five customers, who drink beyond all moderation. On this basis there are in the country 4,000,000 of hopeless drunkards, and in Chicago and suburbs 140,000.

This bird's-eye view of this abomination in the United States was written for the special benefit of Chicago citizens, and hence the direct allusion to that city. Somehow we usually regard the metropolis of the West as the special center of all the vices. Unquestionably they do thrive wonderfully there; but it is not so clear that they are much more vigorous in that community than elsewhere. Take, for example, the moral, or rather the immoral, condition of Boston, the city of our special love and of our sweetest memories, and the community which in Europe is credited with having everything worth having in American civilization. We quote from that very able journal, *The Springfield Republican:*

The Boston papers have suddenly woke up to the fact that Boston is a city of unlimited license for at least three social evils—drunkenness, licentiousness and gambling. The *Boston Record*, lively and cleanly, is exposing these things excellently, and it is an untilled field. It shows the streets filled with saloons, several of whose keepers sit in the board of aldermen. It exposes the way convictions for illegal selling, if by any chance such are procured in the municipal court, are appealed to the superior court, and hung up never to be heard of again or fail with juries. Its reporters are exposing the gambling chambers, thronged with patrons, close by the city hall and the most crowded streets.

This is only half the story. The immunity from penalty enjoyed by these vices has demoralized—that is just the word, lowered the

morals—of the people, and there is an alarming tendency to all kinds of crime. Persons and property are insecure. Men are unsafe in the streets at night, merchants and marketmen have goods stolen from their places of business; murder is rife. Business men say it does no good to apply to the police, that they do nothing when appealed to. The police commissioners seem to be a feeble body with no iron in the blood, such as is necessary to govern a great city. The trouble is that the criminal class, including the liquor sellers, govern the city through its city council, and all the powers that be bow to these unclean idols.

It may be "the bias of habitation," as Herbert Spencer would say, that leads us to question the propriety of the good editor of the *Republican* representing Boston as degenerating toward the low level of Chicago; when from all the recited facts Boston would seem to have reached a depth of depravity than which there is hardly conceivable one deeper. There does not seem to be much to choose between them; but then the Metropolis of the West may fairly plead several extenuating circumstances. She is young, and hence inclined to be frivolous and reckless; she has as yet no really homogeneous population, and many who are prominent in her citizenship, unhappily were reared in that once glorious New England, now being traded for dollars into the hands of a foreign labor class; and where they were early inducted into those habits which are rendering their birthplace now so conspicuously unsavory. Oh, New England! Naturally and historically our head of gold; for once the West was but the feet of iron and of clay, with New York and Pennsylvania for the breasts and arms of silver in the great national image, how art thou changed! Alas! "how is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed!" Dimmed and changed it is when the native-born population is driven into the great Northwest, and beyond the "Rockies," that cheap labor may enrich a few nabobs, and that foreigners, men of a different faith as of a different lineage, may by corrup-

tion attain those civic honors which once were worthily worn by unbribed puritans. As to Chicago, all that can be said at present is that she is far from being free of earthy elements; but hopes through some divine alchemy —like the human alchemy of old, which changed, or professed to change, common metals into gold and scorched and dried up the clay—that the baser elements of her being may be transmuted into those more precious which alone can render her worthy of her commanding position and future empire. Certainly, unless the alchemy is divine the transmutation process will drag wearily through the lives of several generations, especially if the following statistics are to be credited. They were carefully compiled in 1883 by some of our leading journals. This is part of a report furnished by the *Tribune:*

There are 3,799 saloons in Chicago licensed for the sale of intoxicating liquors. The number of unlicensed places cannot be accurately estimated, but ex-officials of the city and others, whose calculations are based on a comprehensive knowledge of the facts, have estimated that there is a total of at least 6,000 places in the city where liquor is sold and drank. There were twenty-eight police prosecutions last year for the sale of liquor without a license, but necessarily this can only represent a very small fraction of those engaged in the illegal trade. In numerous groceries, restaurants and saloons the law is successfully evaded. It is also a well-known fact that in many of the low dives with which the city abounds, gambling-houses, houses of prostitution, etc., liquor is sold and drank without any pretense of legal authority. There are some 300 or more drug-stores where liquor is sold in bottle and for medicinal purposes, but leaving these out of the question it may be fairly estimated that there are 5,000 liquor-shops in the city. Estimating the population at 600,000, this gives one liquor shop to every 120 inhabitants.*

Notice here the allusion to low bagnios and gambling houses, showing that we have not only to contend with

*These are not the latest statistics; but those of a more recent date are not materially different.

drunkenness, but also with its sister, prostitution, and with the passion for games of chance. In addition to this we have the following, copied from the St. Louis *Republican* and printed in the *Inter Ocean:*

There are about 1,800 drinking saloons in the city of St. Louis; Chicago has 4,000—more than double the number here. In the state of Missouri there are 3,360 dramshops, 132 wine and beer saloons, 35 drug stores which retail liquor under dramshop licenses, and 74 groceries which retail under dramshop licenses—making a total of 3,601. (The commissioner of Internal Revenue reports 6,950. There must be some who "get away" from the state authorities.) There are more drinking places in the city of Chicago, therefore, than in the state of Missouri. Again: The governor of Ohio states in his recent message that there are more than 16,000 retail drinking places in that state, and the traffic "probably exceeds $70,000,000 annually." Ohio, with one-third more population than Missouri, manages to support more than four times as many saloons. Certainly, in view of these comparisons, we may claim for our people the merit of at least equal sobriety and moderation with those northern populations which are accustomed to make a parade of their virtues. There are eighteen counties in Missouri—Adair, Clarke, Clay, De Kalb, Dent, Douglas, Grundy, Harrison, Hickory, Mercer, Miller, Ozark, Polk, Putnam, Ralls, Schuyler, Scotland, and Shelby—which report no dramshops and no wine and beer saloons.

This is certainly a remarkable showing, and while the contrasts reveal some light, the darkness round Chicago and Ohio is thick enough to be felt. If we would know whether this vice extends in America only to the cultured and refined, or is limited to the offscouring of humanity, let us hear from Miss Carrie Moffit who thus writes of those with whom she had to deal when conducting the Rehoboth mission for dissipated women:

We have had all classes and nearly all conditions of women. Those reared in pleasant homes, in refinement and luxury and well educated, as well as those from the lower walks of life. We have had the daughter of a national bank president, another of a railroad official, the daughter of an aristocratic family in the State of New

York, the daughter of a highly respected family in Iowa, also one from a good family in Michigan, and many others of equal interest. Most of the above named are living earnest Christian lives.

And, in addition, let us hear from Colonel Bain, who in a pungent sentence or two shows that strong drink is no respecter of persons. He says:

Down in Kentucky, some time ago, young Harry Clay, the son of our great southern statesman, lay bleeding to death from a wound inflicted upon him in a drunken brawl by a liquor seller. In the same city, at the same time, the grandson of John J. Crittenden, one of the brightest men who ever graced the United States Senate, was also dying from injuries received while drunk. And at the same hour, the great-grandson of Patrick Henry was in a prison cell, brought there by drink. Look at those great men, way off there on the summit of fame, and then look at their offspring, disgraced by drunkenness.

Personally we have known female votaries of Bacchus, and have been called to see them when they had reached the maudlin stage of drunkenness, and particularly desired religious conversation. They generally were disgustingly pious at such times. Some of these women moved in what is known as "the best circles." Thus, then, not only are the victims of this vice to be found among the socially degraded and among men, but likewise among those who rank as ladies and gentlemen. But in justice to our women let it be said that they are freer from this terrible habit than their sisters of other lands. Yet we fear from the reports of physicians that many of them are given to the use of opium in some of its forms; and in various quarters it is hinted that liquor is abandoned merely in deference to public opinion, while secretly noxious drugs are substituted in its place. This may be the case, and if it is we are indeed stricken with a curse. Bad enough to be so widely governed by Alcohol, without the baser degradation of servitude to the bane of Asiatic people. Assuredly we are in a deplorable

plight. After many changes for the better, after many temperance victories, still we are enslaved. No rank seems to enjoy entire immunity from the peril. Lords and gentlemen, "right reverends and wrong reverends of every degree," especially the *wrong reverends*, magistrates, lawyers, merchants, young and old, ignorant and cultured, the rich and poor, in nearly all countries and under various forms of civilization, are more or less in bondage to the drinking habit. Its captives are numbered by the million, and on its domains the sun never sets, or rather never rises; for they are so vast, and horrible, that they seem to comprise an empire of limitless darkness. It can claim the allegiance of many nations, tongues and peoples; and though no monarch is as merciless, brutal and fiendish, sparing its friends less than its enemies, neither is any more faithfully served, nor served with so marked a disregard for reputation, comfort and prosperity.

We have observed in tracing the magnitude of intemperance the appearance, as though in intimate fellowship, of the criminal practices of the Brothel and the Gambling Hell. They form a sisterhood of evils, a trinity of Hell. But in our opinion were the first of the vile crew destroyed, the others would decline in vigor and attractiveness, and, possibly, would disappear altogether. But of this we may be confident, that so long as men and women become sots, the infamous resorts for the indulgence of inordinate desires will flourish. The measure, therefore, of the drinking habit may almost invariably be taken as the measure of existing licentiousness; consequently, we might leave you to infer from what we have said regarding the extent of the former what are the present limits of the latter. But while this course might be satisfactory to many, there are those who need to be reminded of the threatening prevalence of harlotry and gambling that they may be impelled to undertake something to check

their growth, and this can only be done by recalling some details of these sores in the body politic. We shall be as brief as possible; for we have no taste for sewage, and no pleasure in lingering near the cesspools of fallen humanity. James Greenwood, in 1869, startled the world by declaring that in London there were 8,600 prostitutes, and yet later writers have added largely to this figure. It is probable that no one can give more than a proximate idea of its real total in any of our cities. Ever must it be largely guess-work; for where there are so many reasons for concealment as there are when sexual relations are lawless, multitudes of cases will be kept from the public eye. The labors, therefore, of statisticians, however valuable, at best can only afford us a comparative estimate of what is significantly termed "*the* social evil." Indeed, we have sometimes thought that the appalling revelations made by the *Pall Mall Gazette* last July, give us a clearer idea of its virulence and prevalence than any array of numbers can; for the sickening accounts published by that journal indicate how ruthless and devilish the baser passions are; and by the prices paid for victims, and the vile means used for their entanglement, how tyrannical and merciless is lust. It is not necessary to reproduce these articles, still a brief extract or two may serve to recall the entire narrative; and if thought on for a few moments may put parents and daughters alike on their guard. The *Gazette* gives prominence to the following:

If asked to describe by far the most ruinous crime of London vice, we would point, not to the fashionable West End brothels, nor to the systematic procuration of girls and women, but to the great drapery and millinery establishments of London, in which every year hundreds, if not thousands, of young women are ruined. It is pitiful to think of the number of young girls, tenderly trained and carefully educated in schools in country villages, who come to London only to find the business, on which their parents built high hopes, but little better than an open doorway to the path leading to Hell. It is

stated that at a certain notorious theater no girl ever kept her virtue more than three months. At an equally notorious business house at the West End it is rare to find a girl who has retained her virtue more than six months. The head of a great London emporium regards the women in his employ much in the same aspect that the Sultan of Turkey regards the inmates of his seraglio, the master selecting the prettiest girls and the underlings following his example. Many emporiums are little better than horrible ante-chambers of brothels. The system is creeping into scores of London establishments for the female employés to eke out their scanty wages in prostitution.

* * * * * * * * * * *

London is the greatest market for human flesh in the world. A great colony of importers and traders in girls exists in the French quarter, where it is the all-absorbing idea of each wretch to get a girl, body and soul, into his possession whom he can drive into the streets to ply her vocation while he lives upon the proceeds of her prostitution. Count von Munster, German Ambassador to London, in reporting to Berlin dwells horrified upon the discovery that there is an organized trade in German girls between the principal cities and London.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Under the headline, "An interview with an Ex-Slave Trader" the following is given: "John S——, a gray-haired Belgian of noble appearance, who has just served six years in a prison in Belgium, states that a score of English girls are exported to Belgium and the north of France monthly for immoral purposes. Two-thirds of these he asserts, think that they are going to situations, and under this mistaken idea are lured to their ruin. The exporter is paid so much a head if the girls are in a healthy state, and nothing if diseased. The average price paid is £10 per head. The ages of girls range from eight to thirteen years. The business of procuring and exporting these girls is chiefly conducted by a woman known by the name of Kate.

This is fearful, and is the darkest blot on our civilization. But let us not suppose that England is alone in her iniquity. Such is not the case. There is France with her voluptuous tendencies and gilded indecencies; and even our own Puritan country has no sufficient reason for saying

"stand aside, I am holier than thou." A citizen of Great Britain in Chicago, roused by the sarcastic comments of the city press on the immorality of London, expresses himself in the accompanying letter, published in the *Tribune*, and which gives a not unfair picture of this evil as it exists in many American cities.

Granting that the *Gazette's* reports are true to the letter what city on this continent—had we one—of 4,000,000 could not greatly discount them? Here in Chicago vileness of the character referred to by the *Gazette* is rampant, and it is not hidden so much as it is in London. Traffic in young girls of tender age is not needed, as our streets at certain hours find scores of them, scarce in their teens, soliciting immoral commerce. If the two crimes could be weighed in the same scales it would be found that more men are seduced by young girls—children, rather—than girls seduced by men, young or old. I can call to mind within less than six years where five *virtuous* working girls tendered themselves as "lady friends" to one gentleman, provided he would keep the matter to himself and help them to purchase finer clothing than the wages they were receiving would enable them to buy. These five girls were pure so far as their virtue was concerned when this offer was made, as they were examined by a physician to test that fact. The devil had been put into their heads by one of their shopmates, who was "lady friend" to a railroad official, who gave her seven dollars per week. On another occasion a *mother*—bear that in mind—*volunteered* the use of her two daughters, virgins—both handsome girls, one fourteen and the other sixteen—to a gentleman, provided he would pay her rent for a building on Michgan avenue where she desired to let out rooms. Being told that such a vile proposition was infamous on her part she coolly remarked that here in Chicago the thing was not uncommon, and that the girls would most probably fall into evil ways anyhow, and that she, their mother, might as well have the benefit of their services as anybody else, as she had to feed and clothe them. We need not go abroad for vileness. It is here with us.

Ah! If these things are so, and question them we dare not, how much better are the creatures given up to this vice than Herod, Nero, Heliogabalus and other Sybaritical wretches of the ancient world? We seem to be imitating

their unspeakable obscenities. Yea, it looks as though we were pressing hard after the debauches of the more modern Valois; were greedily conforming to the putrid dissoluteness of the Bourbons; and were mimicking the prudish corruptions of the court of Louis XIV. The shameless excesses of the Regency, and the gilded bagnio of Louis XV., and the dominancy of the infamous Pompadour, and of the more infamous Du Barri, all appear to have something like a contemptible counterpart in the nineteenth century. Alison writing of that period in France declares "that all we read in ancient historians, veiled in the decent obscurities of a learned language, of the orgies of ancient Babylon, was equaled, if not exceeded, by the nocturnal revels of the Regent, the Cardinal Dubois and his licentious associates;" and is it not likely that this sentence, with but little modification, fairly portrays the hold that salaciousness has on some classes still? But while prostitution wherever it reigns is as horrible now as ever in the past, we do not think the past could ever show as strong a sentiment in favor of home and of the domestic virtues, or a clearer conception of the dignity of personal purity than prevail at present. There are apparently two streams flowing side by side; the one is black, slimy, filthy; the other limpid, transparent and pure. At the beginning the black river appeared to extend everywhere, almost bankless; but when the white one came its channels were slowly, alas! too slowly narrowed, and to-day, while it is as foul and putrid as ever it was, the white river has expanded its bosom, grown broader and deeper, so that we are not without hope that in the fullness of time it shall outstrip and overwhelm its fecculent neighbor. This allegory hardly needs interpretation. The rivers are licentiousness and chastity. They have been flowing for many centuries in close proximity, and they have never changed their character. The former is as vile and repulsive as it was in the

days of Nero, and always will be; but the latter is slowly making its way, and the very exposure of the beastliness of its shameless rival must add materially to its victorious progress.

Gambling, the third of the vices we are considering, like licentiousness, seems to belong to no age in particular, but to all. And it is only reasonable to conclude that now as really, if not in the same degree, it exerts its almost irresistible fascinations over civilized and savage men, over kings and subjects, over the ignorant and cultured. When it succeeds in obtaining dominion, its rule is imperious, and generally enduring. Dr. Eckeloo published a book exposing the awful phases of this fearful malady; and yet with his own book quoted against him, fell a victim to the terrible scourge. Sir John Denham also tried in vain to break the spell that bound him to the tables; and even poor Oliver Goldsmith failed to emancipate himself from its charm. So strong are the chains forged by a passion for games of chance, that the enlightened rulers of Japan enacted this law: "He who ventures his money at play shall surely be put to death;" and the Western nations have also been compelled to adopt stringent restrictive measures. Such being the case, it is not easy to determine the due proportions of this vice in modern times, as it necessarily, in many instances at least, courts secrecy. Indeed, the wide-awake mayors of our cities and our police officers, blessed forever be their sagacity and watchfulness! say that they cannot discover the haunts of gamblers, and that they can give no estimate of their number or resources. We have, however, sometimes thought—may we be forgiven the base suspicion!—that they could easily know more than they claim to know were it not that they frequently rely on blacklegs to forward their election to office, and conveniently overlook what it is their duty to suppress. These officials are certainly

blind to what is familiar to every one who is crazily intent on ruining himself. The fact is, they cover up the truth, and imagine themselves to be a kind of a Supremer Court, and assume the right to pronounce on the advisability of enforcing laws, if not to decide on their constitutionality. This is practically the course they usually pursue. They know the law forbids gambling, and yet they have the impertinence to assume that its execution is discretionary with them, as though they were a tribunal of appeal above all tribunals known to the Constitution. What they are really authorized to do, is simply to enforce the statute as it stands, without regard to its wisdom or unwisdom; and if they fail to do it they should be held amenable. It ought to be enacted that the city where a man is robbed by gamblers shall be counted responsible for the crime, shall refund the money to the victim, and the neglectful officials pay a heavy fine. Under some such wholesome regulation it would be a comparatively easy thing to estimate the strength of the gambling fraternity, and equally easy to determine the prosperity of their nefarious calling. But we must not suppose the den of the "Tiger" is always concealed and ever seeks retirement. No; in a degree it courts publicity, especially when it has received an encouraging wink from the authorities. The author of the *Nether Side of New York* said that in 1872 there were not over one hundred faro banks in the metropolis—we presume he meant to add "known to the know-nothing mayor." He also shows that the leading places of this character are equipped from garret to cellar with great splendor, and that every device fitted to lull the moral sensibilities is found within their walls. Rich carpets cover the floors, choice pictures hang from golden rods, while gilded furniture and elegant ornaments are artistically arranged about the rooms. Waiters are employed to anticipate the wishes of the guests, refreshing

viands and sparkling wines, free of all cost, tempt them. Think of the thousands of such splendid and luxurious dens in this and other lands, and of the millions invested as capital in them and in the game itself; and likewise of the fact that in some of the more aristocratic gambling hells $100,000 will at times be hazarded; and a faint idea at least may be formed of the extent to which prevails this consuming and deadly curse. If to all this we add the various lottery schemes, some of which have received the support of a few states; also the common habit of betting on every conceivable uncertainty, from the speed of a horse to the issue of an election; and if we unite with these the mania for speculation, which, after all, is only betting clothed with the respectability of trade, we shall have a pretty wide area covered by the operations of this reckless spirit, and shall be tempted to conclude that its blighting influence is almost conterminous to humanity itself, especially to the male portion thereof.

These vices are necessarily very costly, and it may not be wholly useless to ascertain, if possible, how costly they are. To many of us who look on these subjects from the standpoint of political economy they are simply enormous sources of wastefulness. They are a constant drain on the wealth of a nation as they are on its honor and purity. As we have shown, very frequent are the lamentations over the inequalities of Society, and as a rule very Utopian remedies are proposed. One party would divide land among the population; another would distribute wealth and land both; and most of our so-called reformers would have the sober and industrious classes do all the sacrificing for the elevation of the people. But there is one thing they don't suggest, without which there can be no permanent advancement, and without which all sacrifices would be absolutely vain. They do not propose to save the millions now annually swallowed

up by dissipation, and which, if judiciously invested, would very soon provide every poor family in the land with a home. It is not necessary, even if it were feasible, to confiscate private property for the public good. All that is needed is to apply the money now squandered in liquor, gambling, and lewdness to the purchase of lots and farms, and if freeholds can make a prosperous people we should be prospered. In proof of this, let us look at a few figures, which if they are not very poetic are certainly very instructive. "Ireland's drink bill," an American paper informs us, "is for one year $50,000,000. Absentee landlords, accounted one of her greatest curses, draw annually from the people but $26,000,000. Mr. Villars Stuart, member of parliament for Waterford, made the statement in Dublin: 'One-half of the amount of what is annually spent for drink in Ireland would, if annually applied for the purpose, buy, in fifteen years, the fee simple of all the farms in Ireland.' It would be well enough to deny any further American donations for the political emancipation of Ireland until that unhappy land shows some disposition to help itself by curtailing its whiskey bill." Chief Justice Coleridge, of England, says that four-fifths of the crime in that country results from drink, for which the British subjects pay some $500,000,000 a year. Another instructive example is furnished by Germany. In the kingdom of Prussia, in 1882, the estimated expenditure on spirits alone was 61,000,000 marks, while all the direct State taxes for the same period produced but 150,000,000 marks. Taking the whole expenditure upon beer, wine and spirits, it amounted to 907,000,000 marks, or more than double the amount realized by the Prussian exchequer for its taxes, stamp duties, etc.

But let us come to our own nation, and ascertain what it costs to supply our enlightened citizens with liquor. Mr. Edward Atkinson has shown that it demands

$5,690,000,000 to feed our teeming population; and it is an interesting inquiry, how much does it require to quench the thirst of this multitude? In reply we give an article published recently in an illustrated paper, and founded on reports printed by the National Bureau of Statistics.

It is commonly supposed that the amount of money spent in this country every year for intoxicating liquors forms one of the smaller items of expenditure. The facts, however, show that the drink bill of the country exceeds the cost of any other article of daily consumption. In the year 1883 (ending June 30th) the government received in internal revenue as taxes on distilled spirits $74,368,775—a sum which, at the rate of ninety cents a gallon, represents 82,631,972 gallons. This quantity of liquor was chiefly composed of whiskey and brandy. The price of whiskey, as sold at the saloons, is fifteen cents for each glass of half a gill, or $9.60 a gallon; the price of brandy is twenty-five cents a glass or $16 a gallon. At the drug stores the best brandy retails at least at $12 a gallon, and the best whiskey at $5. To the consumer, therefore, it becomes evident that the cost of this quantity of eighty-two millions of gallons would be at least $6 a gallon. The total sum, therefore, thus expended would aggregate $495,791,832.

In 1883 the government received as internal revenue for taxes on fermented liquors $16,900,615—a sum which, at the rate of duty of $1 a barrel, represents 16,900,615 barrels. Each barrel contains at least thirty-one gallons. No less, therefore, than 523,919,065 gallons of fermented liquor form the annual consumption in the United States. Each gallon contains a dozen glasses, and a glass is seldom or never sold at less than five cents, and is frequently sold at double this price. On this basis, therefore, $314,351,439 are thus expended.

It is well known that while we export little or no liquor, we import large quantities. In 1880 the duties on imported liquors exceeded eight millions of dollars. It is also well known that large quantities of native wines are consumed. It is further generally recognized that a considerable amount of whiskey and of other distilled liquors escape taxation. But, on the contrary, liquor is used for mechanical and scientific purposes. The quantity thus used is, however, in comparison with that otherwise consumed, small

To sum up, then, these various facts: Excluding all imported liquors and all native wines, and allowing that the amount of spirits that escapes taxation is equal to the amount used in mechanical and

scientific pursuits, it is made evident that the annual drink bill of the United States is equal to $800,000,500.

The relative size of this expenditure becomes manifest by reference to other expenditures. In 1880 the total product of all the "flouring and grist mills" of the country, according to the census, was $505,000,000. The value of all the woolen goods, including nearly every article in the manufacture of which wool was used, was $237,000,000. The value of the cotton goods was $210,000,000; of boots and shoes, $196,000,000; of sugar and molasses, $155,000,000. In the year 1881 the States and Territories spent for public education about $85,000,000. The churches of all denominations demand for their annual support about $60,000,000. The drink bill of the nation equals its expenditure for all cotton and woolen goods manufactured, for all boots and shoes worn, and for all sugar and molasses consumed The annual drink bill exceeds by $300,000,000 the annual bread bill.

These estimates—which we venture to believe will appeal to the reader as reasonable—do not include the indirect cost of the liquor drank. This indirect cost embraces waste of time, the expenses attending the trial of offenses committed by persons intoxicated, and the expense of $100,000,000 in the maintenance of the million paupers of the country. The wardens of the State prisons usually affirm that intemperance is the chief cause of the crime of at least four-fifths of the criminals; and it is universally confessed that it is the principal agent in the creation of the pauper class of the community.

We hope it will not be attributed to vanity, if we once more introduce Chicago to the attention of our readers. We reside there, and necessarily on that account are somewhat biased; but it is only as a matter of simple justice to her that we show that she does her full share in wasting these almost fabulous millions. She is always thirsty, perhaps drinks more liquor per head than any other city, not forgetting the rivalry of Boston, and certainly she leaves St. Louis far behind, and swallows more atrocious stuff than the entire State of Missouri. In this respect she excels, as in almost everything else of the same kind. The struggle for higher license which took place a short time since, led her leading journals to investigate the real condition of the liquor traffic in the metropolis of the West,

and resulted in much valuable and reliable information. We give in substance what we have gathered from these sources, moderating rather than exaggerating the figures. And first of all, we learn that there are over 3,700 saloons, which annually receive at the rate of $30 for each of our 600,000 inhabitants. A newspaper recently stated that in a space of five blocks one way by four another, there are 500 liquor saloons, 200 bagnios, 150 concert saloons, gambling houses, and pool-rooms, where 12,000 young men resort daily. The total amount squandered in Chicago for drink is about $18,500,000; but who can tell what the other vices cost? There is no way of obtaining a reliable estimate. Of course, we can guess from the number of places where infamy carries forward its trade, and from the hosts of servants it employs, that its maintenance must involve millions. But how many? If, with the liquor bill before us, we venture to suggest that the citizens pay $30,000,000 per annum for all forms of dissipation, we think we shall rather underestimate than overestimate the amount. But to realize the true significance of these figures let us note what revenue the city receives from those who are permitted to carry on a business which is thus impoverishing, and what she expends on education. Set over against each other, the account stands: Revenue, at $52 a license, $192,000 in all; education, about $800,000.* For this trifling sum she endangers the well-being of the community, and though $30,000,000 at least are being spent to debase and corrupt her people she can only afford some $800,000 to provide a remedy. It likewise will help to measure this waste if we ascertain how many churches she has, and the money needed to carry them on.

In Chicago there are 260 churches, small and great; the average expense of conducting each, set at $8,000 gives us

* The present high license hardly varies the relative proportion of these estimates.

$2,080,000. What a contrast! For the education and regeneration of man we spend each year less than three millions; for his corruption and ruin we pay forty. Do you wonder that there should be as much sorrow and hopeless agony as there is, and that so many should be apparently doomed to poverty? Remember that of the $18,500,000 spent for drinks in this city, at least $10,000,000 comes from the pockets of people in moderate circumstances; and that this sum carefully handled would give each year two thousand families comfortable homes valued at $5,000 each. But, bad as all this is, if we are to believe the attorney, Harry Rubens, Esq., who appeared on behalf of the saloon-keepers before the committee on licenses during the discussion to which we have referred, the witnesses quoted have not done this fair city justice. According to Mr. Rubens, she drinks far more than we have made out. We hasten to correct our error, if error has inadvertently been committed; and therefore append an abstract of his speech, with some comments—seemingly ungracious—on its estimates made by the *Standard*. The advocate argued against higher license in these terms:

Everybody who knew anything about the business—the expense of running it—was aware that with an average income of $25 a day a saloon-keeper was barely able to make a living—hardly more than the wages of an ordinary mechanic; and it would be an act of injustice to charge these men a greater license fee than $52. But when the receipts exceeded that sum, the expenses being about the same, the profits were large, and a saloon-keeper who took in $35 to $50 a day was able to pay a larger sum for a license. Where the gross receipts increased from 10 to 15 per cent, the profits increased in a greater ratio. For this reason he asked that the minimum fee be fixed at $52 for saloons whose yearly receipts were $10,000 and under; that those which took in more than $10,000 and less than $15,000 be charged $100; those between $15,000 and 20,000, $200; those between $20,000 and $25,000, $350; and all whose gross receipts were more than $25,000, $500. The latter would cover all that took in $60 a day, those in the heart of the city and some on the outskirts.

And here we have the *Standard's* reflections:

It seems, according to this—and Mr. Rubens would not speak at random for his clients—that the daily receipts of the 3,800 saloons of this city range from $25 to $60 per day. At the minimum the receipts would be $9,128 a year. Multiply this by 3,800, and we have the enormous sum of $34,775,000! Can it be possible! Take the next figure given by Mr. Rubens, and call it an average, and the receipts of one saloon reach $12,770, and of the 3,800 the $48,526,000. If Mr. Rubens is anywhere correct in his figures, the cost of liquors to the drinkers of Chicago is double what we ever supposed it was.*

Assuredly his representations are staggering and confusing. It seems utterly incredible. Why, a city that spends as much as this for drink and as little for schools, colleges, churches and art, ought to take as its only suitable symbol infamous Jack Falstaff, with his penny's worth of bread and his enormous quantity of sack. We hope that under the new license law an improvement is taking place. We are persuaded that it is not stringent enough to curtail this awful waste in any sensible degree. Would that it could be cut down, even to one-half; would that the entire nation, as well as our own city, would reduce its score at the dram-shop; yea, would that the American people would arrest this prodigality for good and all. What can we expect when our population in America drinks $800,000,000 and pays $400,000,000 more to provide prisons, poorhouses and asylums for those whom the drink has mastered and maddened, but misery, degradation and ultimate despair? Then, $60,000,000 is all that this nation contributes for the annual support of its churches, and much of that is given grudgingly; and yet some persons affect to be surprised that religion is not more potent, and that the masses are not more prosperous. Surprise! We rather think the surprise is that such enormous sums can be squandered, and applied to human deter-

* The present high license hardly varies the relative proportion of the estimates.

ioration, and this nation or any other be able to escape bankruptcy alike in character and fortune.

In the face of all figures to the contrary, there are quite a number of intelligent people in every large community who cannot see, or at least assert that they cannot see, how the liquor traffic, which gives employment to so many thousand men, and pays so large a revenue to the government, can possibly be wasteful, or in any way perilous to a nation's financial soundness. We, on our side, are amazed, to speak politely, at their obtuseness; but perhaps it may make the matter clearer to their minds if we invoke the aid of a few primary economical principles, which justify all that we have said regarding the ruinous prodigality of vice in general, and of the drinking habit in particular. Political Economy, as our readers are aware, is concerned with wealth; is that branch of inquiry which aims to ascertain the laws and how best they can be expressed, governing its production, distribution and consumption. A great variety of definitions have been given of this science; and while the one we have suggested may be open to criticism, for all the purposes of this argument it is sufficiently accurate. To be more precise would involve us in discussions beyond the demands of the issue before us, and, therefore, would be of no advantage to the reader. Wealth being the subject of this science, we are first of all naturally led to ask, what are its sources? Some disagreement exists on this point: Adam Smith himself seems to have held no very consistent views regarding them; but in one place appears to teach that labor is the mother of all wealth, and in other passages that it is derived from land, labor and capital. (*See Wealth of Nations*, Vol. 1, pp. 1–44; Vol. 1, p. 78; Vol. II, p. 24.) Subsequent writers, and notably, some writers of today, claim that labor exclusively is entitled to the honor of enriching mankind. But whether this narrow doctrine is the true one or not, we know that all three of

these factors are engaged in the production of intoxicants and in their distribution; and that in an inferior degree the same is true of gambling and lasciviousness. A multitude of laborers are employed in all three of these departments, immense capital is back of them; and a vast acreage all over the world is devoted to the growing of cereals for brewing and distillation; and an immense amount of real estate is likewise used for storehouses, saloons, bagnois and gambling hells. But, though all these means are set to work, is the money which results from their adoption deserving the name of wealth? In other words, has there been anything gained to the community from these investments; toils and endeavors? To answer this question fairly we must notice the distinction drawn by Political Economy between productive and unproductive labor. Turn to *Wealth of Nations* (Vol. II, p. 12), and you will there read.

> There is one sort of labor which adds to the value of the subject upon which it is bestowed: there is another which has no such effect. The former, as it produces a value, may be called productive, the latter unproductive labor. Thus the labor of the manufacturer adds generally to the value of the materials which he works upon, that of his own maintenance and of his master's profit. The labor of a menial servant, on the contrary, adds to the value of nothing.

And on the same point Mr. J. S. Mill, arguing that "labor is not creative of objects but of utilities," and that "these utilities are of three kinds," he presents them in the following order:

> 1. Utilities fixed and embodied in outward objects; by labor employed in investing external material things with properties which render them serviceable to human beings. 2. Utilities fixed and embodied in human beings; such as knowledge, skill or experience. To this class belong teachers, professors, clergymen, physicians, etc. 3. Utilities not fixed or embodied in any object, but consisting in a mere service rendered, a pleasure given, an inconvenience or pain averted, but without leaving a permanent acquisition in the improved qualities of any person or thing. To this class must be referred the labor of the musical performer, the actor, the reciter and the showman.

Mr. Mill also observes, "We should regard all labor as productive which is employed in creating permanent utilities, whether embodied in human beings, or in any other animate or inanimate objects." And yet on the whole, when he reaches his climax he is constrained to conform to common usage, and to "understand by productive labor only those kinds of exertion which produce utilities embodied in material objects." Here then we have the answer to the question we have asked, regarding the economic worth of vices which call to their support toil and capital. If that only is productive labor which "adds value to the subjects on which it is bestowed," or "which renders them serviceable to human beings," or improves the beings who are to enjoy them, or at least averts pain from them, then the labor devoted to the liquor traffic is necessarily unproductive; for it adds no additional value to the material used in its various branches, creates no permanent utility of any kind, and instead of being even a temporary source of harmless amusement, is the cause of privation, sorrow, and crime.

But there is another economical principle closely allied to the one we have just applied, and which may be stated and examined with good effect in this connection. It refers to productive and unproductive consumption. What is meant by these terms two masters of Social Science shall teach us. The first of these authorities is Mr. Senior (*Political Economy,* pp. 54–55) who remarks:

"Productive consumption," is that use of a commodity, which occasions an ulterior product. Unproductive consumption is, of course, that use which occasions no ulterior product. The characteristic of unproductive consumption is, that it *adds to the enjoyment of no one but the consumer himself*. Its only effect upon the rest of the community is to diminish, *pro tanto*, the mass of commodities applicable to their use. Some commodities are unsusceptible of any but unproductive consumption; such are lace, embroidery, jewelry and other personal ornaments, which are simply decorative, and afford neither

warmth nor protection. Under this head may also be ranked *tobacco, snuff and other stimulants.*

The other is Mr. John S. Mill, who writes in the book from which we have frequently quoted, as follows:

All the members of the community are not laborers, but all are consumers, and consume either unproductively or productively. * * * What productive laborers consume in keeping up and improving their health, strength, and capacities of work, or in raising other productive laborers to succeed them, is productive consumption. But consumption on pleasures or luxuries, whether by the idle or by the industrious, since production is neither its object, nor in any way advanced by it, must be reckoned unproductive. * * * There are numerous products which may be said not to admit of being consumed otherwise than unproductively. The annual consumption of gold lace, pine-apples, or champagne must be reckoned unproductive, since these things give no assistance to production, nor any support to life or strength, but what would equally be given by things much less costly.

Now it needs no argument nor even the appearance of argument to prove that harlotry and gambling are not only unproductive, but worse than unproductive, are indeed absolutely destructive; and the case is as conclusive against intoxicants. Keep the definitions and distinctions of Mr. Senior and Mr. Mill before you, and you cannot fail to see, unless you willfully close your eyes, that the consumption of beer and ardent spirits has all the characteristics of unproductive consumption. It does not result in any ulterior product, unless it be crime and suffering; it contributes to no one's enjoyment except it be that of the tippler, and the pleasure he tastes very speedily turns to bitterness; it deprives the community in proportion as it prevails of commodities necessary to its well-being, and it fails even to improve the laborer's health, strength and capacity for work; and, therefore, for all these reasons it must be regarded as thoroughly unproductive of anything having worth or value to Society. If it shall be said that the economists we have quoted rank the use of jewelry, gold

lace, and pine apples with the consumption of liquor, and that, therefore, we ought to speak of them alike and in the same terms of contempt; we may be permitted to observe that, while with propriety they may be placed in the same category, they are yet in several respects very dissimilar. There is not as much money lavished on the former as on the latter; and what is expended comes mainly from the pockets of the affluent, and not, as in the case of strong drink, from the meager earnings of the poor; then, as to diamonds and precious ornaments, they have a value that is comparatively permanent, while liquor of every kind is essentially a perishable article; and in addition to all this, luxuries such as Mr. Mill refers to, apart from intoxicants, have never been known to work such mischief to health and morals and property, as intoxicants have. But even if there were not this to be said in extenuation of the consumption of lace, ornaments, and other personal extravagances, it would not help the interests of stimulants one particle. It would only prove that humanity is more reckless, prodigal and improvident than had been supposed, and would leave untouched the great fact that alcohol is more thoroughly destructive of wealth than any and all other pernicious agencies combined. To sum up what we have said, if the manufacture of liquor cannot be classed with utilities, then it is wasteful, and the more capital and labor it employs the more wasteful it is; and if the consumption of liquor is unproductive to community of any advantages in return, then it is still wasteful; that is, however, viewed by Political Economy the same sentence is pronounced against the entire traffic and use of intoxicants: they are pronounced to be inexcusably wasteful, inevitably tending to pauperism and financial cataclysms. They are as fatal to material prosperity as the rush of the simoon would be to a garden of flowers or a field of grain; and we might just as well regard the simoon as the breath

of Paradise, as to suppose that the drink trade and the drink habit have in them any promise of deliverance from poverty and ever increasing destitution. All the vices are alike in this respect. There is very little choice between them, save as to the extent of their desolations. They are destroyers, marauders, despoilers, rapacious and insatiable, and Society can never hope for any remarkable change for the better in its condition until they are outlawed and overthrown.

The terrible indictment which the bitter experience of generations warrants us in drawing up against these three Gorgons would be incomplete were we to overlook their repulsiveness and guiltiness. They are mean, horrible and criminal; and yet, strange to say, they are not without apologists. Especially is this true of the liquor plague. Though the editor of the *London Times* twelve years ago wrote of drunkenness in England as a "nuisance and scandal," and declared that "the use of strong drink produced more idleness, crime, disease, want and misery than all other causes put together;" and though Sir William Gull, the eminent physician, asserts "that alcohol is the most destructive agent in the country;" still there are men so infatuated that they enter a plea on behalf of what they are pleased to term "temperate drinking." They would have a community play with fire and not be burned; they would have humanity sip poison and not be killed. This is the common delusion and it has led to ignominious graves. A recent writer has expressed the opinion "that the moderate drinker, other things being equal, will do better work in the world than the total abstainer." Further, "that the half million of drunkards are but poor stuff, for whom we have no business to sacrifice in our daily duties, the added force which alcohol would give." And to confirm his position he has suggested that "the ruling powers of the world have ever been addicted to

ardent spirits." We shall not discuss with this gentleman the physiological effects of alcoholism on the body and brain of mankind. Indeed, the question has already been thoroughly examined, and has been definitely, and we may say finally settled against its claims. It is a poison, deranging the system, exciting and then depressing unduly, ending at last in paralysis or madness or both combined. This is the verdict of science. As to the best work being done by those who rely on its stimulating properties, we are not prepared to admit any such assumption. In all departments of thought and endeavor there has of late been very much accomplished of exceeding great merit; and Society is beginning to perceive that men may be skilled physicians, eloquent pleaders, wise statesmen and successful merchants without being tipplers. Indeed, the conviction is rapidly gaining ground that they will be more reliable, efficient and clear-headed the less they have to do with intoxicants. It is true that "the ruling powers of the world" have not been abstainers. Possibly this fact may account for their corruption, oppressions, blunders and cruelties. Could it be shown that in the past temperate nations have succumbed, and that nations where drinking has been encouraged always or generally prevailed over them and eclipsed them in civilization, then we might begin to fear that a drift toward sobriety would result in social degeneracy and decay. As it is we have not one historical instance of an entirely sober country, of a country where officials and people have been wholly free from the influence of liquor; and, consequently, any sneering depreciation of such a government is gratuitous, and a poor defense of a bad cause. But we have instances innumerable of what kingdoms and states become when the appetite for strong drink rages; and if a temperance Monarchy or Republic could possibly ever be worse than these, then is hope of amelioration utterly vain and

misleading. It can easily be shown that the Assyrian, the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian Empires, and that Egypt, Greece and Rome, after cultivating in their earlier years the virtue of temperance and even enforcing it by law, were successively overthrown by the predominance of luxury and drunkenness; and their history thus proves that it has been a curse to mankind for "the ruling powers of the world" to muddle their brains and stupefy their hearts. Its use has always been a peril and never an advantage; and that it ought always to be so regarded may be gathered from the terms in which Mr. Lecky describes the Act of Parliament by which the distillery trade was opened to English subjects in the eighteenth century. In his history of that period, he writes:

> These measures laid the foundation of the great extension of the English manufacture of spirits, but it was not till about 1724 that the passion for gin drinking appears to have infected the masses of the population, and it spread with the rapidity and violence of an epidemic. Small as is the place which this fact occupies in English history, it was probably, if we consider all the consequences which have flowed from it, the most momentous in that of the eighteenth century, incomparably more so than any event in the purely political or military annals of the country. The fatal passion for drink was at once and irrevocably planted in the nation.

Such testimony as this is conclusive against the plea we have been reviewing, and ought to convince every candid inquirer that it is unsound in every particular. Sir Andrew Clark, an eminent medical authority, has no patience with such shallow and idle defenses of a great curse. After declaring in a speech that in his hospital practice he found seventy out of every one hundred cases the result of strong drink, he exclaims: "When I think of the terrible effects of the abuse of alcohol, I am disposed to give up my profession—to give up everything—and go forth upon a holy crusade, preaching to all men, Beware of this enemy of the race!" We share his pas-

sionate indignation when we read the silly advocacy of a habit which has never been anything but a scourge to humanity; and which instead of helping to produce better work and higher government, has ever, in the long run, deteriorated the one and debauched the other.

It is a singular fact that the vices of Society are often extenuated on the ground that they are the outbreak of natures which are unduly generous and free. It is claimed that kind-heartedness and a spirit of genial fellowship are the causes of dissipation; and that in our condemnation of the evils we should not overlook the excellences from whence they spring. Vicious tendencies by such apologists are almost converted into virtues; and young men are encouraged to follow their own base inclinations by the thought that in so doing they are merely exhibiting the warmer and more admirable side of their character. Such talk is enough to disgust all decent and cleanly souls. Knowing as they do that carnal excesses spring from the animal propensities, and not from the benevolent emotions, and that they are indulged in a thoroughly selfish manner, they cannot but regard this plea as utterly false. That such a judgment is neither harsh nor narrow let the vices themselves bear witness. There is a custom yet prevalent that marks the infamy of excessive drinking. At feasts one gentleman, when inviting another to drink wine with him, usually says: "I pledge you;" and this social form is traced to treason and assassination. History informs us that Edward, the English king, while drinking from a goblet on horseback at the gate of Corfe castle, was stabbed between the shoulders by the order of Elfrida, his stepmother. The murder awakened general distrust of men when they were in their cups, and led to the custom of requiring a pledge of convivial neighbors when about to taste, just as the robber demands that his victim shall hold his arms up to prevent

unpleasant contingencies. Here we have impressive testimony to the fact that it is not generousness that leads to dissipation, but rather meanness and wickedness. Frequently and awfully is this testimony confirmed. Every little while men are arrested for beating their wives to death in a drunken fit. Having sold her furniture, having deprived her of bread, having starved her, frozen and abused her, some such maudlin villain tramples out the wasted life which at the altar he vowed to honor and protect. Not long since we met the sickening details of a monster who delighted in torturing his helpless children, tying their naked bodies together and kicking and bruising them until he was overcome with fatigue and fell into a drunken slumber. An earnest and intelligent writer in the *London Times* gives similar thrilling illustrations of the natural effects of alcholic stimulants. He says :

There is not a clergyman in any large town but has his memory charged with scenes of cruelty to wives and children, often going on to murder, of destitution and ruin, of hindrances to religion, to education, to social progress, every one of them directly caused by the drink. Not a day passes but typical cases are occurring to which most clergymen could find parallels in their own experience. Here are two or three from your own columns of the past few weeks :

1. (In the same paper with the article.) A woman, Payne, burnt to death by a lighted paraffin lamp thrown at her by her husband—drunk at the time.

2. Joseph Laycock, of Sheffield, cut the throats of his wife and four children. Both of them drunkards, and shortly before had come out of a public house together, apparently on friendly terms.

3. At Bootle, in Lancashire, one brutal wife murder, another wife murder and suicide in one week.

4. The latest of all, in which, when a father had murdered one or two of his children, and came to another, he was met with the piteous cry, "don't do it to me, dada," and yet did it.

Is it said that these are exceptional cases, representing their own special horrors and nothing more ? Here is a list, then, of crimes committed during the last week of 1883 and the first of 1884, col-

lected from country newspapers by the *Alliance News*, every one of them stated to have been "under drink": 12 manslaughters or murders, 15 cases of suicide, 18 of attempted suicide, 63 drunken outrages and violent assaults, 26 perilous accidents, 13 robberies, 20 stabbings, cuttings and woundings, 5 cases of insanity, 5 of cruelty to children, 74 assaults on women, 70 on constables, 13 cases of juvenile intoxication.

So, likewise, the *Inter-Ocean*, Chicago, presents for the benefit of all who are favorably inclined toward the drinking habit, some additional evidences of the overflowing generosity which is alleged to be its source. We hope our readers will ponder these marks of the manly, chivalrous spirit which it exhibits.

Of all the boys in the reform school at Pontiac, and in the various reformatory institutions about the city, 95 per cent are the children of people who died through drink or became criminals from the same cause. Look at the defalcations: fully 90 per cent of them come about through drink and dissipation. Go into the divorce courts: fully 90 per cent of the divorces come about by drink, or drink and adultery both. Of the insane or demented cases disposed of in court here every Thursday, a moderate estimate is that 70 per cent are alcoholism and its effect. I saw it estimated the other day that there are 10,000 destitute boys in Chicago who are not confined at all, but are running at large. I think that is a small estimate. Men are sent to prison for drunkenness, and what becomes of their families? The county agent and the poor house provide for some. It is a direct expense to the community. Generally speaking, these families go to destruction. The boys turn out as thieves, and the girls and mothers generally resort to the slums. Governor Gaston in a message to the Massachusetts legislature says: "Intemperance has been the most prolific source of poverty, wretchedness and crime. It has filled the State and the country with its destructive influences, and its progress everywhere heralds only misfortune, misery and degradation."

These, then are some of the magnanimous doings of intemperance! Fie on it, for a coarse, cowardly, animalistic, savage monster, delighting in the sufferings of others. Of course it will be said that blame for such excesses as we

have noticed must be laid on the quality of the liquor and not on the heart. Absurd! It ought to be laid, first of all, on the low, cruel nature of the man which is excited by the liquor. But, divide the responsibility as you please, that which leads to such results is thoroughly contemptible. We ourselves have seen the dead body of a wretched woman stretched on a filthy bed, with her half naked children, pale and hungry, staring at the motionless form from whose hands they had never received anything but blows, and whose crazy career had blighted their childhood. To gratify an unnatural appetite we have known honesty sacrificed, friendships broken, and every sacred and ennobling relation to be disregarded and dishonored. And as this vice is the principal cause of the others; and as they are certainly distinguished by black-hearted meanness, there can be no language adequate to portray its despicable vileness.

But let us look for a moment on its corrupt and corrupting sisters. Enter a gambling hell, such as was recently described by a Chicago paper, where everything is conducted on robbing principles; and to maintain the business think of the means to be employed—swindlers to rob players by the aid of marked and pricked cards, and "cappers," "steerers" and "ropers-in" to coöperate with them, combined with the stealings from office drawers, and the stimulating potions from convenient saloons, or yet more convenient sideboards. But that you may have a clearer idea of the open-hearted manliness and unselfishness of the blackleg fraternity, take this picture from the article referred to, and which appeared in the *Herald*. The reporter is giving an account of one chivalrous and generous soul, McDonald, who, it seems, is quite prominent in refined gambling circles:

> Immediately about him, as a sort of guard of honor, at 176 Clark street, he has Clif DeHority, George Noyes, Charley Winship and

Billy Tyler. DeHority gets 15 per cent of the game. George Noyes, who is McDonald's brother-in-law, gets 20 per cent, and Winship 10 per cent. Billy Tyler is paid $40 a week. McDonald's interest in the game is 55 per cent, and the furniture and fixtures are all insured in his name, unless he has had the policies transferred since the recent exposure in the *Herald* of the inside workings of the partnership. The four men whose names are published are skilled "skin" dealers, and deal nothing but crooked cards. Two sets of "casekeepers" are hired, one set for the day and one for the night, to assist dealers in swindling. The duty of a casekeeper is to mark the cards as they are drawn from the box, and the services of a cheating casekeeper are needed where fifty-four and fifty six cards are dealt. This place employs from twenty to thirty "cappers," "steerers" and "ropers-in" constantly. That 176 Clark street is a "skin" house is known by every professional gambler and "fly" man in Chicago. They play no favorites there, robbing everybody who comes within reach. The special feature of the game is the "working" of drunken men. Free whisky is kept on the sideboard in the gambling room—liquor of the most abominable quality, of a grade called "go-your-money whisky" by gamblers, on account of its sense-destroying attributes—and players are encouraged to drink it, in order that they may lose what little intelligence God endowed them with. When crazed with liquor they become reckless, and give up their money more freely.

In an equally vivid manner our reporter gives a sketch of a lady (?) member of the rascally guild, who is furious because some dens have been closed by the police, and who has great confidence in her power to influence some distinguished city officials. This is how he puts it:

The deal the bloodsuckers are getting has infuriated the mob, and Saturday afternoon and evening the female partner came up town, filled up on wine and made an exhibition of herself on Clark and Dearborn streets, cursing like a drab and boasting that she had more influence at headquarters than anybody, and would "put a stop to this thing." "We will follow those who are trying to ruin us," she shrieked in drunken frenzy, "from pillow to post, and we will drive them out of town." That she was not arrested and carted to the lockup indicates that she may have a "pull" of some sort on the City Hall, but just what the extent of her influence is and how she works it is at this writing a matter of conjecture. Her partner's (Mr. Mike

McDonald's) solidity in that quarter seems to have been badly shaken lately.

These portraits taken from life ought surely forever to decide the character of the sin before us. It is evidently black with infamy; and is as utterly destitute of pity, of gentleness and mercy, as is the tiger which it has chosen as its emblem. Enslaved by it men have been known to sacrifice the home and fortune of children, and to have staked a wife's honor on the throw of the dice. It demoralizes, it corrupts and is only outstripped in shameless depravity by its nearest kin, the Social Evil, which flaunts its gaudy attire on our streets and thrusts its painted face into our public assemblies. My God! what terms are adequate to portray the despicableness, viciousness and even beastliness of lust! The attempt to describe the indescribably filthy would only defile the pen of him who writes and the mind of those who read. We shall not, therefore, attempt anything of the kind; but there are just two scenes, silhouettes, black reflections and outlines of black immortality, which we will transfer to our page and leave them to tell their terrible stories of betrayal, ruin and revenge. The first is from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and is worthy the pen of Dickens. Engaged, we suppose, in searching out the "Social Evil," the writer having related various failures of attempts to procure a certain kind of victim, continues thus :

But at one villa in the north of London I found through the assistance of a friend a lovely child between fourteen and fifteen, tall for her age, but singularly attractive in her childish innocence. At first the keeper strenuously denied that they had any such article in the house, but on mentioning who had directed us to her place the fact was admitted and an appointment was arranged. There was another girl in the house—a brazen-faced harlot, whose flaunting vice served as a foil to set off the childlike, spirituelle beauty of the other's baby face. It was cruel to see the poor wee features, not much larger than those of a doll, of the delicately nurtured girl, as she came into

the room with her fur mantle wrapped closely round her, and timidly asked me if I would take some wine. Poor child, she had been out driving to the Inventories that morning, and was somewhat tired and still. It seemed a profanation to touch her, she was so young and so babylike. There she was, turned over to the first comer that would pay, but still to all appearances so modest, the maiden bloom not altogether having faded off her childish cheeks, and her pathetic eyes, where still lingered the timid glance of a frightened fawn. I felt like one of the damned. "She saw old gentlemen," she said, "almost exclusively. Sometimes it was rather bad, but she liked the life," she said, timidly trying to face the grim inexorable, "and the wine, she was so fond of that," although her glass stood untasted before her. Poor thing! When I left the house as a guilty thing—shrinking away abashed from before the presence of the child with her baby eyes—I said to the keeper who let me out, "she is too good for her trade, poor thing." "Wait a bit," said the woman, with a leer. "She is very young—only turned fourteen—and has just come out, you know. Come again in a couple of months, and you will see a great change." A great change, indeed. Would to God she died before that! and she was but one.

This is one of the silhouettes—the other has on it the stain of blood. The scene was not in London, but in a city nearer home. To see it we must pass the portals and enter the temple of justice, where a poor fallen creature is on trial for her life. Her still handsome features show signs of suffering, and yet of exultation. What are the particulars of her crime? She shot her lover in an excess of fury—a lover who had not hesitated to apply the "wages of sin" earned by her in a career of shame to liquidate his gambling debts; and this young man was counted generous and genial, as good natured; and not unlikely was spoken of by some as a little fast, but "honorable, you know;" and yet he appropriated to his own uses the earnings of a prostitute and repaid her oftentimes with blows. Having alluded to such scenes as these we need not refer to others. This is enough to show that licentiousness is essentially merciless, cruel, selfish and deceitful, and that it is next to blasphemy to speak of frankness and nobility in the

same breath with it; and enough has been said to prove that the entire group of vices are without one redeeming quality, and that to him who fosters them may be applied Castelar's scathing portrait of Nero: "Here in these gardens he walked, clothed in purple, shod with azure buskins; his temples crowned with laurels; his eyes fixed on the heavens; in his hand a zithern; on his tongue ancient Greek verses, and in his heart evil passions; he was consul, tribune, dictator, Cæsar, sovereign pontiff—all blessed him, all adored him; but, alas! he was despised by his own conscience." Such is vice—such are its lovers—garlanded, adorned, and contemptible even to themselves.

Can it be then that criminality does not attach to these indulgencies ? We unhesitatingly answer in the negative. But we must all be aware, however incredible it may seem, of a theory which pretty nearly annuls all distinction between right and wrong, by ascribing every type of viciousness to inherited and uncontrollable physical appetites. This theory is undoubtedly the legitimate outcome of an exaggerated philosophy, which regards the intellectual and moral nature of man as the mere result and product of material forces. It may likewise have been favored by the reaction which occurred years since from the unreasonable servities of the old penal code; and it may have been strengthened by a feeling generated in Society, that having done so little to prevent vice, it ought not to be over-harsh or over-swift in pronouncing condemnation. But whatever may be its origin or its support we cannot subscribe to it. We do not question but that many of the victims of excess are to be pitied more than denounced. They were weak, circumstances were unfavorable, they were tempted, fell ; perhaps were driven by manifold trials into wrong-doing. We commiserate but we dare not wholly exonerate. The fire of indignation is partly quenched by tears of sympathy; but it burns nevertheless. That there may be varying

degrees of guilt we do not deny, and that every instance of waywardness ought to be judged by itself we admit; but that the fatalistic theory is tenable, and that men may disfigure character and life without criminality, we do not believe. To our way of thinking such casuistry is an outrage on the common sense of the world. Take the accusations brought against intemperance by Judge Pitman (*Alcohol and the State*), weigh them carefully; and in view of them answer your own conscience whether it is not absurd twaddle and empty sentimentalism to consider inebriation otherwise than as a crime:

1. Drunkenness itself is, by statute and by reason, a crime—a social nuisance.

2. Drink excites the evil passions; how much or how little it takes to do it is a question of temperament and circumstance.

3. It fortifies for crime.

4. It throws off the reins of prudence. Recklessness is one of the first fruits of drink. Reason teaches that crime is folly; alcohol clouds the reason.

5. It tempts to crimes, especially to lust and robbery, by putting the victim in the power of the criminal.

6. And emboldens to crime by rendering its detection difficult when the necessary witness is wholly or partially insensible.

7. Idleness and poverty are prolific agencies in the production of crime; but intemperance is the main cause of these.

8. Truancy is regarded as one of the most common proximate causes of crime. But among the causes of truancy that which so far transcends all others as to be properly considered the cause of causes is the immoderate use of intoxicating liquors.

9. Intemperance is the efficient ally of other vices. Wine has been well styled "the devil's water power." Without it much of the machinery of evil would stand still.

But if the love of strong drink can thus be branded righteously, what shall we say of gambling and licentiousness? Are they less blameworthy and devilish in their nature and influence? No; they must rank with their sister, and wear with her the penitentiary garb of guilt.

It will not do to say that these things are wrongs, things to be remedied, things that are abominable, but for which the perpetrators should not be severely censured. "A fire is a great evil, and destroys much of value. We do not court it, or fan it; but at the same time we do not become hysterical and denounce the materials because they are combustible." Very true. But we would condemn the incendiary who should apply the torch, and we would not keep him out of prison, or deal with him as an unfortunate being, because he happened to have a mania for burning. We would try him and punish him. Vice also inflames, consumes, destroys, and should not the men and women who kindle the spark, or who fan the blaze, be held equally accountable? People who are not philosophers instinctively and promptly answer "yes." But many who are philosophers, or who so regard themselves, will still argue that the poor creatures who have gone wrong are enslaved, that the power of volition has been practically lost, and that they are therefore to be looked upon with an eye of forgiving compassion. The editor of a religious journal several years ago met this plea in a very straightforward manner, and indicated somewhat vigorously its worthlessness. Having termed it "The Gospel of Imbecility," he writes: "Undoubtedly the wills of men do become weakened by vice. But a will that has become weak is only strengthened by using it, and you do not encourage a man to use his will by telling him that he has no will to use." Precisely so: and we as good as say to every inebriate, to every roué, to every gamester, if we adopt this syllabub theory of fatalism, "My dear Fellow, you can't help being just what you are, and you can no more change your nature than the tigress can change hers." But is not this to paralyze virtue, and to render reform impossible? How can we change the unchangeable, how alter the unalterable, or restrain the irresistible? It cannot be done; and if man is in this

changeless state, a state preordained by the eternal Destinies, then he cannot be rescued, and he is not accountable. Such a mechanical, soulless, despairing creed we most heartily repudiate.

That it is not true is proven by the fact that thousands have reformed and have become conspicuous for virtue; and that the world instinctively condemns those who do not repent and lead noble lives. Of course, if men hold to the doctrine of impotence they will talk sugary things regarding those who adhere to their dark ways; but if they themselves are the sufferers, if it is their fortune which the clerk squanders at play, and if it is their child whose "soul's white lillies are robbed" by some lecherous villain, nature and common sense will cry out within them demanding vengeance. At such a moment they will realize the fallacy of their theory. They will not then speak of fixed and ungovernable tendencies; they will emerge into what will be to them practically a new world, and will exclaim, appealing to human and divine law, "Avenge me on my adversary!" Yes, deep down in the heart the conviction abides that vice is culpable. It may be obscured, but it is there. It is there, even in the hearts of the vicious themselves. The inebriate, like poor Charles Lamb, condemns himself; the courtesan who shoots her paramour and the rake who abuses his mistress, look not on each other as unfortunate, but as unworthy; and the reprobate who, like Byron, throws a coin on some dark night to the woman he has ruined and receives it back with scorn, as he did, his shivering victim imitating and mocking his limping gait, hastens away as one who is pursued by the phantoms of deeds which are without excuse. They all bear witness to the awful truth that dissoluteness is criminal. And how deep, scarlet, measureless this criminality is, let the thousands of neglected, wretched, houseless children; the

hundreds of sad, poverty-stricken, desolate homes; the scores of orphan and foundling institutes where nameless ones find refuge; the other scores of asylums for the deaf, dumb, blind, and insane who have been robbed of their senses and their reason; and the greater number of jails, prisons and penitentiaries, with their brutal, violent and desperate tenants, find tongues and testify. Let them speak, and their words, interpreted by judges, physicians and philanthropists, will roll at the door of these black vices the responsibility for nearly every sigh, tear, groan, and wail wrung from the poor human heart; and, therefore, they who, in the presence of such world-wide horrors, can give them hospitable entertainment deserve to be classed with the worst enemies of the race.

Holland many years ago wrote an admirable article on "the Canonization of the Vicious." He showed how, in the opinion of many persons great and rare abilities palliated and excused moral infirmities. The licentiousness of Goethe, Burns, and Byron he pointed out did not hinder multitudes from rendering homage to their genius. Though they ruined innocence and stimulated drunkenness, we know almost everywhere they are extolled because they possessed the gift of song beyond their fellows. The meaning of this singular devotion seems to be, that if we can sing sweetly we may sin serenely, and if we can think brilliantly we may transgress blamelessly. In other words, according to this way of judging, a poem is worth more to Society than self-denial, and art is more precious than righteousness. Such is the logical outcome of special pleadings on behalf of wayward genius. Somewhere it is related by Froude that Pope Clement when his chambers rang with cries of justice on Benvenuto Cellini, whose murders deserved the gallows, exclaimed: "All this is very well: these murders are a bad thing. But where am I to get another Benvenuto if you execute this one?" With

his Holiness, talent exonerated crime, and with many people talent still exculpates vice. Let a great theatrical performer come to the city, and though he is known to be a reprobate he will be feasted and flattered; and let an actress of real merit, but of loose morals, appear on the stage and columns of praise will be devoted to her, and she, too, will be courted and honored. So of our artists, our young business men, our promising professionals, however far they depart from virtue—unless they are foolish enough to create some public scandal—they are received everywhere, and all whispers to their discredit are hushed with some remarks touching their smartness. To be "smart" is an apology for much wrong-doing. But so long as this is so, is it likely that we shall succeed in rescuing the thousands who are not smart, but who are vicious? No, we deprive ourselves of power when we overlook in genius what we condemn in commonplace. This is felt; and there grows an impression that, after all, vices are not so terrible and that their indulgence is forbidden, not so much on account of their wickedness, but because rich people and cultured people don't want the poor and ignorant to share in their hilarity. If we abate vice we must treat it alike wherever found. It must disqualify one class for social privileges as certainly as another, and it must no more be respected when allied with talent than when it is associated with stupidity.

From what has been said regarding these abominations, it must be evident to all that their suppression, is not only the duty, but is the supreme necessity of the hour. As we have intimated more than once, and it is a fact which cannot be too frequently reiterated, there is no work so imperatively demanded or so full of promise to the future of Society as this. But the question arises—and the Babel-tongued answers it receives indicate its seriousness—how is this much desired result to be achieved? . Various are the measures pro-

posed, and at times bitter and fierce is their unhallowed rivalry. Instead of coöperating together as far as possible in a sacred crusade against the common enemy, they frequently come into conflict with each other, are intemperate in their mutual abuse, and are total abstainers from charity. They seem to be overcome by the dead-drunkenness of oblivion so far as discernment of anything meritorious in their respective schemes is concerned. In the meanwhile the dissipation which enervates, and the excess which palsies humanity, are not banished, but seem rather to thrive in this atmosphere surcharged with the elements of strife and storm. Glendower declared that he could "call spirits from the vasty deep;" and Hotspur replied that so could he, but wisely queried "whether they would come when called." In the opinion of the fiery soldier the performance, not the mere invocation, is the thing. So the prohibitionist affirms that he can summon the spirit of sobriety from the fathomless depths of politics; and the high-license man asserts the same of himself; but not a few gravely and even harshly express the doubt whether sobriety will ever heartily respond to voices such as theirs. Evidently thus far it has not come when called, and the other virtues have also been as reluctant to appear; from all of which we may gather that there is as much need for coöperation in reform movements as in business enterprizes. Probably if their friends could combine, and would as far as they could, and if they were willing to recognise the absolute indispensableness of moral forces in their campaign against vice, and ceased to sneer at them and underrate them, their success would not be as problematical as it is now. The men and women who lead in the great conflict against entrenched iniquity must learn that they cannot afford to despise weapons devoted to the glorious enterprise, because they were not manufactured by themselves, nor reject them because they were not patterned after their own. We must

cease to censure, even though we may criticise, we must cease to insult though we may not be able to praise, and we must cease from denouncing all means and methods but our own as compromises by which, to quote from the *Temperance Review* on the subject of high license, "the devil may open by-ways to hell for five hundred dollars a year." The peril is so imminent, so vast, so overwhelming, that what our hand finds to do we must do with our might, and what it finds to do it with must be employed without delay, for as Browning says,

> Knowing ourselves, our world, our task so great,
> Our time so brief,—'tis clear if we refuse
> The means so limited, the tools so rude
> To execute our purpose, life will fleet,
> And we shall fade and leave our task undone.

Of all the forces that are brought to bear against drunkenness, gambling and harlotry, we believe that more reliance should be placed on those of a moral and spiritual character than on any others. Legal enactments are undoubtedly useful, and in some instances may prove efficacious; but whether to prevent, arrest, or exterminate these banes no agency can surpass in adaptability and vigor those which search out and deal with the inner and higher nature of man. Appetite defies restriction, and lust overleaps all barriers. Though the saloons of Chicago have to pay a $500 tax instead of the nominal amount exacted of old, and the revenue derived from them has risen to $1,500,000 instead of the paltry sum formerly collected, there has been no perceptible abatement in the quantity of liquor consumed in that city. In Maine, where prohibition has been for some years legally in force, strong drink can very easily be procured. Bangor, we are told by Gail Hamilton, has over a hundred places where it is sold, and free rum is practically the rule. "You can get liquor enough," she testifies, "for bad purposes in bad places,

but you cannot get it for good purposes in good places." These statements are not decisive against the need and worth of legislation. It were an illogical conclusion to infer from the disregard of law that its enactment is useless and valueless. What we are warranted in deducing from the frequent evasion of statutes and government authority is simply that, taken by themselves, they are not able to cope with and suppress the animal instincts and passions of humanity, and that to do this absolutely necessary work a different kind of agency must be employed. A cage restricts the liberty of a tiger, but it does not change him; and if he can, he will break through his prison bars and display the tiger-nature to the horror of all who try to intercept his progress. So we may encage Vice in amendments to the Constitution and in city ordinances, and some good may be accomplished; but these things do not slay the monster itself, and until it is wounded to the death, there is no telling when it will break through, mock every restriction, and carry wretchedness and dismay to a myriad homes. Incarceration and coërcion then are not sufficient, and something more than shackle, gag, hand-cuff and iron collar are needed to save humanity from this tyrant scourge. The work of redemption must be wrought mainly in the head and the heart of man, not in his surroundings. He must be taught the reasonableness of self-mastery, the dignity of personal purity, and the criminality of weaknesses that lead to defilement. His mind must be instructed, his will must be strengthened, his conscience must be quickened, his affections must be cultivated, and every faculty and power of his being must be trained in the habitudes of virtue. Surely it is superfluous to add that such effects can only be produced by moral means; that is, by education, home influences and religion.

The family is the great conservator of purity. No

agency can do its special work, and no movement should be countenanced that in any degree would diminish its sense of responsibility. Parents are the most important builders of character in the nation; they do more than lay the foundation—they determine the course of development. Many among them fully realize their obligation, and conscientiously seek to shape and mold their children aright. Were they all thus honestly to accept their mission, and faithfully to discharge it, there would be little need of repressive legal enactments. Reform, therefore, must begin at the family. The household must be entirely purged from wine-drinking, from gaming habits, and from the demoralizing influence of divorce; and fathers and mothers must be urged to do their duty in fortifying the minds of the young against the seductive power of debasing temptations. But domestic discipline ought to be supplemented by public education. The school, the free school, the common school, ought to give more attention to morals than it does. We all know and reverence its power; but we equally know that it is deficient in ethical instruction. Religion has been practically excluded from its halls, and the authorities have been unable to provide a substitute. At present, therefore, we are to all intents and purposes without any recognized standard of right and wrong in our public institutions. To their credit be it stated, many of the teachers try to obviate this defect by their own example and by occasional words of counsel. But they have neither text book nor hour devoted to the study of ethical science, and scholars can hardly do otherwise than infer from the almost exclusive attention bestowed on Geography and Arithmetic that they surpass in practical value and excellence the law of upright conduct. Moreover, the teacher's commendable endeavors are frequently checked by the criticism of some ignorant or bigoted member of the

School Board, to the end that she is teaching the Protestant Bible; and as frequently they are more than neutralized by the secret introduction of obscene pictures and books into the desks of the boys and girls. To some of our readers this last statement will appear incredible, nevertheless it can be substantiated. In schools where the Bible must not be taught, where prayer must not be offered, and where formal instruction in morals is utterly ignored, debasing novels and polluting colored photographs have been found. We will not particularize, for we have no desire to spread the infection. The fact is as we have stated it, and even worse than we care to put in type. Is this a specimen of paternal government? If it is, there is certainly room for improvement. At the dictation of an alien population and of a church that owes allegiance to a foreign potentate, we have expurgated everything that looks like ethical instruction, and yet have not been watchful enough to keep out the subtle agencies of immorality. That is, we are prompt to exclude the good lest we should offend a multitude who have but little sympathy with our institutions, and yet are comparatively indifferent to the invasion and ravages of the bad. If this is the practical working of "paternalism" in a department where it can be efficiently applied, and where it seems to be necessary, we can judge what its outcome would be were it unreservedly adopted as the organizing principle of government. The baser elements, then, would not only be in the majority, but they would rule out everything offensive to them at all hazards. Christians can never consent to the supremacy of this principle without sacrificing liberty of conscience, and surrendering religion to the tender mercies of its natural enemies; and they cannot but deplore that it should thus far have proven so inadequate an ally of virtue when applied to our school system. We insist that

there must be a radical change. Begin at the foundation. Let education even in its earliest stages assail vice. Instead of burdening the memory with wearisome details regarding mountain and stream, develop character. Realize that the end and aim of true endeavor in this department is not to cram but to draw from, not to put in but to bring out. And among other qualities to be "educed" or to be "led forth," are those which relate to the discernment, and defense of virtue. Let the conscience be properly enlightened, the will be judiciously strengthened, and the desires and appetites be duly disciplined, and we shall no longer send out from our schools victims but conquerors. Men, therefore, who really long for the deliverance of our country from drunkenness, gambling, and licentiousness, while they may advocate legal measures of repression, will primarily and principally address themselves to the indispensable task of "educating" the young out of their inherited and natural tastes and tendencies, which, if left alone, will inevitably rebel against all State law and ultimately end in ruin.

In this work also the Church has an important part to play. Indeed she is the source, or to speak more strictly, the channel along which flows from the divine source, the purest morals and the sublimest ideals and motives. Her mission on earth is not merely to save the soul, but to save the life as well. She sustains relations to Society as well as to Heaven. In the world to come she is to have a crown because she has been victorious, and in the world that now is she should have a throne, provided she is useful. Mystically she is the bride of Christ, and practically, if she is anything, she is the mother of virtue. Figuratively the Church is generally presented as a woman, and literally, at times, she is not unlike some women in timidity, haughtiness, and love of display. She was designed to be an image, type and prophesy of celestial purity and glory;

but not infrequently she has been made the counterpart of terrestial tinsel and shoddy splendor. Alas! she has also played the harlot with kings, courts, millionaires, and fashionables, seeking to please them, flattering them by imitating their foibles, and overlooking their monstrous iniquities. Of course there have been seasons when she has grasped to some extent the sublime character of her vocation, has shaken the dust of this corrupting earth from her garments, and has risen a terror to tyrants and wrong-doers; but never, so far as we can learn from her history, has she fully and adequately discerned her heaven-appointed place in the conflict between virtue and vice, or employed as she ought the weapons entrusted to her against the insulting defiance of the latter. We shall not speak of periods in her career, when she herself was scandalously given over to strong drink, gambling, and lasciviousness. The past is past, and let it be past. We would not revive it. Rather would we think of the Church as she is at present, the avowed though somewhat polite enemy of every pernicious habit. She never had fewer members who use intoxicants, nor fewer who disregard morality in other respects than now. In comparison with her condition in other times, she is clean and beyond reproach; and yet she seems to be only half alive to her responsibility for the appalling dissipation of the age. She has no deep and abiding conviction that she has facilitated the growth of viciousness by her indifference, and by her seemingly wilful blindness to its fatal progress, or that she can do more than civil government toward its extermination. When moved and excited on the subject she frequently declaims against officers of law, judges, policemen, and rulers, insisting that if the authorities would only do their duty Society could easily be freed from its moral plagues. Her sermons on this point are generally very eloquent, and not altogether unjust. We are satisfied that our officials could do more than they do to deliver com-

munity from the evils which disgrace it; but at the same time we are convinced that they are no more to blame for their permanence and prominence than the members of the Church. The law as it exists, undoubtedly ought to be put in force, and this duty rests on the State, and if performed our affairs would be in a more salutary way than they are. This is unquestionable. But it is also true that the moral sentiment which is needed to uphold the execution of the law, and without which it must ever be a dead-letter, is in no small degree the creation of the Church, and if it does not exist as it should she is proportionately accountable for the failure to men and God. Moreover, she has to a great extent the custody of the young, and exerts a widespread influence over the home, and is, therefore, inexcusable if she does not through them impede the development of animalism. In revolutions long and manifold she has occasionally condemned Sybarite and Cyprian, and has sanctioned temperance societies here and there and patronized "Retreats" for fallen women; but even in these directions her efforts have been languid and almost perfunctory. Her ministers mostly are preaching what they call "salvation," which when accepted does not necessarily save from wine-bibbing, card-playing, and from other forms of self-indulgence; and if these same ministers should happen to lay due stress on the enormity of vice, and should denounce the dissoluteness of the age, not a few of her members would gravely reprove them for not proclaiming the "gospel," and very likely would threaten to withdraw their support on account of the bigotry of the pulpit. If a pastor condemns the rum traffic some of his dear people are almost sure to accuse him of preaching politics—as though it were an unpardonable sin for a clergyman to love his country—and if he arraigns the libertine and the courtesan in unmistakable terms, he will hardly escape the charge of indelicacy; and if he lays the axe at the roots of gambling

in the fat soil of the Stock Exchange he will be avoided as a fanatic or be reproached as a slanderer. The actual condition of the Church is simply this: She is more decent in her own life than ever before, and entertains the very self-complacent impression that her mere existence must influence and promote reform in others; but she has no fervid desire to engage in a direct and intense warfare against current indecencies. This is true of her as a whole. Among her members, however, there are many notable exceptions.

There are entire congregations that discern the signs of the times and know what Israel ought to do, and heroically attempt to do it. But considered as a unit, as a single body, and getting at the average life of the body, the condition of the Church is just about what we have represented. A change for the better is therefore needed. The Bride of Christ, must, first of all, cease reproving the government for its faithlessness until she herself has become more faithful to her vocation; she must, in the next place, release her ministers from the arduous task of tramping from house to house on no particular errand save to pet and coddle dissatisfied professors of religion; and then she must purge herself from every affiliation with vice, and direct her energies and organize her forces to subdue it. By concerted and well-planned action she can each year visit every family in the land, can instruct, explain, admonish, and beseech, and can come into personal contact with the mass of the debauched and inabstinent. Her agents must not hesitate to enter saloons, dives, and bestial stews of every type, and entreat and persuade revelers, guzzlers, black-legs, harridans, and wantons to abandon their fearful business. Their success will not be immediate, neither will it be uniform. They will be reviled and ridiculed; but the Woman's Crusade in Ohio has demonstrated that Vice cannot withstand the sustained and determined

attacks of Virtue. If the Church is in earnest let there be held a representative congress of all denominations, not to discuss learned questions of about as much value as some that perplexed immortal Pickwick, nor to define the policy of government, neither to invoke its intervention, but to decide in what way Christianity unitedly can most effectively bring to bear the moral means at its disposal on the grave problem of the hour. We are not advocating a prohibition convention, nor a dull, dignified, wind-blown assembly for the passing of resolutions, but a great religious gathering of all sects, grimly intent on looking facts in the face, and pledged to combine forces and move with the precision of an army. Such a gathering should define the duty of the church and should organize to meet it promptly, systematically, and perseveringly. This can be done; this is feasible. The movement thus organized, loyally supported in every town and village, aiming, as we believe it should aim, at personal effort with individuals and families, could not fail to make a profound impression on every community, and would ultimately lead to most satisfactory results. Given a united and earnestly active Christianity, and less than one per cent of what it costs to degrade the nation for the support of workers, and to provide for the immediate needs of those who abandon traffic in iniquity, and government or no government coöperation, we may confidently promise the future comparative, if not entire freedom from the accursed vices, which, like the waters of the Fountain of Death shown in the story of Ubald, now excite the thirst and mercilessly kill. But if we are mistaken, if this confidence is misplaced, then can we only wonder whether, after all, this religion, the religion of marvels, of Christ, and of magnificent assumptions, is as grand, mighty and divine as we have heretofore believed, and whether at best it may not merely be a beautiful human invention inspiring

untenable hopes, but utterly powerless to deal effectively and successfully with the practical difficulties and dangers of Society.

Although we are immovably set in our conviction that immorality can only be eradicated through moral means, means that go directly to the heart where it has its rootage, we would not discard assistance from any ally that seeks in good faith to coöperate. Mr. Gladstone is credited with the declaration "that it is the duty of the government to make it easy for the people to do right and difficult for the people to do wrong;" and we not only echo the sentiment as expressed, but believe that its application should be extended to those who employ labor and who control its fortunes. Whatever circumstances are favorable to personal pollution ought to be removed as soon as possible, and legislators and capitalists are bound by everything sacred and patriotic to lend their aid in effecting such changes as will render it easier for the people to do right. George Combe, for instance, insists that over-work and under-feeding are among the chief causes which induce the craving for stimulus. Prof. Fawcett claims that the toiling masses are reared in such squalor and misery that to them life is a dreary curse, that moral beauty has no existence for them, and that dissipation becomes the only available gratification. On this subject *The Westminster Review* testifies:

> While men are permitted to breathe pestilential air all their life, how can we expect the love of strong drink to abate? Shorter work or the drooping frame will infallibly have recourse to stimulants. Give the workingmen libraries, amusements; lectures, and leisure for attendance; good and cheap newspapers have already done much to elevate the work-people, and will do much more; park excursions, woods and fields, sky and open air, all elevate and improve man's better nature.

It has been shown by numerous statistical writers that

the majority of girls who enter on a life of shame are the wretched victims of long hours for work, low pay, and unsteady employment. Circumstances, as we all must admit, are not without their power, and while we should encourage all to strive against them when they are evil, we should do all we can to change their character. This we must attempt if we would save the millions. We are not at liberty to leave undisturbed the seeds of corruption, because we purpose to cut down their after-growth. Conscience cannot be pacified by such a line of conduct. We are bound to prevent as far as possible; and much can be done in this direction by putting into practice the suggestions contained in our papers on the "Inequalities" and "Sufferings of Society." The reforms there advocated are of such a character as to diminish temptation, and to render virtue attractive and desirable; and this is just what is needed if the moral means we have described are to be ably seconded, and social regeneration become a fact.

How far government can legitimately and efficiently coöperate in this work is a question not readily answered. We are agreed that the State ought to make it as "easy as possible for the people to do right;" but how far is it at liberty to go in its benevolent mission? May it, for instance, do wrong that the citizen may do right? May it usurp power, and subvert personal freedom so as to render deviations from virtue impracticable? Or is it true as intimated in the *North American Review*, July, 1885, "that a man must often be left free to do wrong rather than forced to do right?" These inquiries indicate that legislation is not without difficulties, and demands more wisdom than the ordinary politician possesses. Certainly up to the present no legislation has successfully dealt with the evils of which we complain. Gambling and prostitution have been prohibited time after time, and are today in most civilized lands; and yet in spite of pains and penalties they

flourish in a remarkable manner everywhere. They have domesticated themselves among us, and the arm of the law seems too short or too feeble to prevail against them. In some countries the general government has tried to regulate licentiousness by licensing the houses where it is carried on; but the result has been exceedingly discouraging. Instead of arresting it, this supervision has apparently only rendered it more virulent. The plague has spread and spread under this fostering care, and the authorities have found themselves at last burdened with a class of women it has helped to form, and without the least proof that their well-intended plans have benefited any one. This line of policy evidently is to be condemned. The license theory will not hold when applied to gambling and lewdness. Prohibition, strict unalterable prohibition, is the only principle which, whether it succeeds or fails, a righteous government, anxious "to make it easy for the people to do right," can adopt. Probably all our readers will agree to this, and probably they will also agree that the very fact of prohibition, whether vigorously enforced or not, must in the long run abate the immoralities we have just referred to by rendering them thoroughly disreputable and criminal. But why should it not be enforced? What is to hinder the execution of laws designed to guard our girls from contamination, and our boys from degradation? Why shall not panders, pimps, and the libidinous wretches who patronize them, and the ropers-in and card-shufflers be dealt with summarily? Certainly there are no physical obstacles in the way. The police force is sufficient, and its knowledge of the guilty parties is adequate. The way is open, the will only is lacking. There is need for moral sentiment to constrain magistrates to do their duty earnestly and thoroughly. This brings to mind again the work the church, the family and the school have to do. They are back of courts and officials, and in proportion as their in-

fluence triumphs will the interdiction of bagnios and gaming dens and of the scandalous acts that are perpetrated therein be made effective.

But how about liquor? Well, we see no particular reason for dealing with it differently than we have recommended in the case of sensualism and gambling. It is not enough to prohibit drunkenness; the making of drunkards must be prohibited as well. The first we have done from the beginning of our history; but the time has come to address ourselves to the second. We know that it has been attempted in Michigan, and that a judge of the Supreme Court has pronounced it a failure, and that Dr. Dio Lewis has expressed the opinion "that it is a wild theory," and that Dr. Howard Crosby has termed it "both a blunder and a farce;" nevertheless we insist that the principle involved is the only one that legislation can adopt in seeking to abolish drunkenness. Thus far the "attempts" in Michigan and elsewhere have only been experiments, and experiments unsustained by popular feeling on their side. They have been made in the face of intense opposition, and with a deliberate purpose on the part of multitudes to frustrate their object. But on this account shall we discredit prohibition? No; unless it can be shown that we should cease to forbid harlotry because we have thus far failed to suppress it. But, moreover, we dare not abandon it, because those who ridicule it in reality testify in its favor. The friends of what is known as "high-license" defend their position by claiming that the measure they propose is prohibitory in its character, and is calculated to retard and not to advance the use of intoxicants. Gail Hamilton thus expresses this view as held by herself and others:

> The Government lays a tax on the saloons, imposes a fine upon smugglers. It might burn the saloons, it might hang the smugglers, if the popular sentiment could be embodied in legislation to that effect. If it did, it would not be a "permit" to the saloons and the

smugglers, but it would be just as much a permit as it is under the present tax, only the conditions of the permit would be a little harder. Yet persons who profess to be working for humanity resist the attempt to restrain the liquor-traffic as strenuously as if it were an attempt to extend it. Misled by the word license, which is a term of restriction, they combat license as if it meant non-restriction. The Supreme Court of Michigan has lately rendered a decision declaring that "the imposition of a tax * * * is not a license but a restraint.

Clearly stated, and we accept the definition, though our dictionaries tell us that "to license" means to "authorize," and to "remove restraint"; yet what have we in this peculiar interpretation but a *quasi* endorsement of the principle involved in prohibition? High license, according to Gail Hamilton and others, prohibits within prescribed limits, and "prohibition" simply does the same thing, only without limits. The two remedies then are substantially alike, the difference between them being only one of extent, not of principle. Admitting this similarity, if not identity, then its application should be determined by the prevalence of the evil it is designed to correct. Of course the details of such a provision, and the plans for its execution may deserve to be characterized as Doctors Lewis and Crosby characterize the provision itself; but if this is the case it merely shares with all other reform movements in imperfections which time and thought may remedy. We do not claim that it is all that it ought to be in its methods, terms, and requirements. These may be defective or not; but we do hold its fundamental demand, that drunkard-making as a business shall be suppressed and annihilated, to be reasonable and just. It is a real gain to know what we desire, and whither we are journeying. The aim distinctly stated is itself an education of the people into sympathy with it, preparing them for future action and for the adoption of measures they would now reject. Assuredly prompt steps should be taken to suppress the

saloon. Conquer that and the entire cause is won. A thousand facts have proven that the saloon is a pest-house breeding idleness, viciousness and crime. It is the ante-chamber of every kind of iniquity and impurity. As well tolerate Fagin's den for the manufacture of thieves as countenance for a moment the vile stews where humanity is plundered, deformed and assassinated. If we can do no better, diminish their number by that peculiar form of taxation, termed "High License." But remember this is only a partial remedy. It leaves untouched many liquor palaces which assume airs of respectability because they escape the fate that befalls others; whereas the best of them, in spite of their rich appointments and their thin veneer of gentility, are thoroughly disreputable and demoralizing. Shut them all up. Give them to the owls and bats. In every state and in every land a law should be enacted forbidding the opening of such places, and on the same grounds as it forbids the maintaining of lottery offices and gambling hells. The dram shop makes it "hard for the citizen to do right," and in this fact lies the warrant for it suppression. Local option is preparing the way for the passage of such a law. Communities that determine for themselves that they will no longer be afflicted with saloons are taking the lead in this great social revolution. By their prosperity and their happiness they will demonstrate that there is no sufficient reason why any such plague-spots should be permitted to exist anywhere. They will intensify public sentiment against them, and the cry will come up from the people generally for their utter extermination. Then will legislators without regard to party hasten to render effective by statute what the popular voice demands. In this direction every sign of the times indicates we are moving, and in our judgment, though many obstacles may yet impede our progress, we shall assuredly reach the goal. The question, how far for mechanical and chemical and medicinal pur-

poses the distillation of alcohol, and the manufacture of wines may with safety be allowed, can only be determined by the future. We do not touch upon it here: we merely appeal to the friends of freedom and humanity everywhere to make common cause against this most dastardly and terrible of all the tyrants—the Saloon.

When the old Roman Consul, Postumius, beheld the young of the Eternal City flushed with wine, and reeling from the public abodes of licentiousness, he indignantly inquired: "Can ye think that such youths are fit to be made soldiers? That wretches brought out of the temple of obscenity could be trusted with arms? That those contaminated with such debaucheries could be the champions for the chastity of the wives and children of the Roman people?" Such questions carry with them their own dark and ominous answers. As we have already seen, the vices emasculate, corrupt and deaden the soul, and, therefore, unfit for the stern responsibilities of freedom. Such enervation is fatal to Republican liberty, and must inevitably lead to malignant feuds, alienations and wretchedness. Goldsmith paints a sad picture in the plaintive lines:

> To see ten thousand baneful acts combined
> To pamper luxury and thin mankind;
> To see each joy the sons of pleasure, know
> Extorted from his fellow-creatures' woe.

And in these words we have a painful description of the heartless and devastating sway of Vice, which renders Society the habitation of human deformities and monstrosities. Are such things as these to be trusted? Must not justice, vigor, purity, honor give way and disappear, if they are permitted to multiply and thrive? Old Postumius once more extends his hands reproachingly and entreatingly and his language sounds as a warning to the people of these times. Freedom, Civilization, Christianity all are being imperiled for the sake of maddening dissipation,

and are being trodden under the feet of the swine of Epicurus. What a disgusting mess of potage are we also offered in exchange for blessings and privileges well nigh priceless. If anything in addition to the dreary facts presented in this paper is necessary to rouse every element of manhood against the outrageous usurpations of iniquity, it is surely found in the insane bartering of everything worth having for a devil's portion. We cannot believe that the nation—that the race—will continue to be oblivious to the sacrifice involved in such a reckless transaction. The hour of wakening must arrive; but we are anxious that it should come early. Therefore, by these sacred names—the names of Freedom, Civilization and Christianity—and by all that is glorious in the past and possible in the future, we entreat the people to forsake the temples of obscenity, and firmly to take their stand on the side of chastity, temperance and integrity. The Egyptian priests used to say that a single touch with the wing of their sacred bird could charm the crocodile into a death-like torpor; and so, the touch of Virtue, the radiance of its presence in the soul, is enough to lull in dreamless sleep and slay the serpent brood which there, too long, has writhed, and hissed and stung. And this heavenly Virtue comes quicker to the call of RESOLUTION than does the dove to the cooing voice of love. Resolve then, invoke the return of the spirit of purity, determine to be enfranchised —that is all; and then shall Freedom, Civilization and Christianity be secure, and be transmitted with all their blessings from generation to generation.

It may be that the entire army of saloonkeepers, black-legs and courtesans, answer our appeal with complaints and groans over the ruin which it promises to bring to them. "Our interests, our property, our prospects," very likely they exclaim, "are as nothing in the sight of this new fanaticism!" Not far from

the truth is this apprehension. Reform does mean disaster to those whose business renders it necessary; but at the same time it is disaster not without compensating advantage. It is related of the wise Polybius that he thought so despairingly of Grecian affairs previous to the Roman conquest, that after this event was accomplished he said with epigrammatic point: "Had we not been speedily ruined, we should not have been saved." We have just the same thing to say to the disreputable army as it moans the probable loss of plunder: "If you are not speedily ruined, it will be impossible to save you." Everyone knows you are pretty much gone to the bad already. Nobody of respectability would give much for your character. Your very wealth is looked on with suspicion as though it harbored curses innumerable; and the poorest man who loves purity does not envy you its possession. There is a general feeling that it is blood-money, and that it is sure to fail the owner in time of need. Few liquor peddlers, and fewer gamblers and harlots die in affluence, and those who do leave behind a golden malediction. Is it not, then, absurd for you to talk of being ruined by the triumph of Virtue? You are beggared now, pauperized beyond repair in reputation, and tending toward inevitable bankruptcy. What you profess to dread is the very thing you should covet. What you really need is just the very kind of ruin you deprecate; for only by the speedy destruction of your traffic, whether in wine or women, is there hope of your ever being saved from meanness, heartlessness and wretchedness, and from the shame of a dishonored name, a despairing death, and a memory accursed.

VI.

THE IMPOSITIONS OF SOCIETY.

What need I care? I cheat in self-defence,
And there's my answer to a world of cheats!
Cheat? To be sure, sir! What's the world worth else?
Who takes it as he finds, and thanks his stars?
Don't it want trimming, turning, furbishing up
And polishing over? Your so-styled great men,
Do they accept one truth as truth is found,
Or try their skill at tinkering? * * *
Dealers in common sense, set these at work,
What can they do without their helpful lies?

* * * * * * *

Don't let truth's lump rot stagnant for the lack
Of a timely helpful lie to leaven it!
Put a chalk egg beneath the clucking hen,
She'll lay a real one, laudably deceived,
Daily for weeks to come.

—*Robert Browning.*

IT is related in the *Gesta Romanorum* that a man came to a certain gate where every humpbacked, one-eyed or scald-headed passenger had to pay a penny for each infirmity, and that when the officials sought to collect the toll for his hunch he resisted, and in the struggle betrayed the fact that he was amenable for every deformity specified by the tariff. "All the ills to which flesh is heir" afflicted him. He had carefully disguised his defects; but the paddings, the stuffings, the wig, the paint, and all the other artifices designed to conceal were of no avail; for a little rough handling disclosed the trick and held him up to mockery as a sham and humbug. This absurd, crooked-back cheat is an appropriate il-

lustration of the Impositions of Society. Like him, Society is not perfect, nor does it claim to be free from blemish. Amiably it admits the hunch, though it does not relish being taxed on its account, and stoutly denies any other malformation or sore. But when search is instituted the painful discovery is made that it is distorted, disfigured, bandy-legged, rickety and misshapen; or, in plainer terms, is to an alarming extent dishonest, tricky, unprincipled and cunning. These graceless qualities it attempts to hide by quackery, shams and counterfeits, so that on every side we find ourselves confronted and bewildered by simulation, empiricism, charlatanism, and *escamoterie.*

A literary friend in Paris last summer handed us an extract from an English journal, which reads as follows:

> From a statement made by the chairman of the North London Railway it appears that 8,584 persons had attempted, during the half year ending June 30, 1881, to defraud the company by traveling without a ticket, or by riding in a superior carriage to that for which they had paid, and the sum total of the payments which they had tried to evade was only £67, or less than twopence each.

Is it possible that 8,584 persons can be found in England who are willing to soil their conscience at the rate of twopence apiece? Conscience is certainly not a high-priced article in that country, if we may be allowed to judge from the report of the honorable chairman. We are suspicious that the evil which he exposes is widespread. He speaks for one railroad company only, and there are many others who doubtless have similar experiences to relate; and he represents only one business interest, and there are others which, very likely, have to mourn over the manifest depravity of an equal number of depredators. If the statement of the North London Railway may be taken as symptomatic, as we fear it may, how tainted, fly-blown and gangrened the moral sense of the British nation has

become. We know the impression prevails that Albion is essentially perfidious. This is her political reputation in the four corners of the world. It is said of her that she drives straight to her purpose *per fas et nefas*, and that she conveniently forgets she is professedly Christian when dealing with subject peoples. And now comes James Anthony Froude with the startling declaration that railway corporations themselves, and with them all sorts of trades and callings, are as far gone in unscrupulousness as the politicians or the general public. Here is his indictment, copied from *Short Studies of Great Subjects* (vol. II, p. 195):

> Railway companies, banking companies, joint stock trading companies, have within these few last years fallen to shameful wreck, dragging thousands of families down to ruin. The investigation into the causes of these failures has brought out transactions which make ordinary people ask whither English honesty has gone. Yet there has been no adequate punishment of the principal offenders, nor does any punishment seem likely to be arrived at. The silk trade is said to be in a bad way, and the fault is laid on the French treaty. It was shown a year or two since that fifty per cent of hemp was worked up into English silk! * * * It was proved in the *Lancet*, after a series of elaborate investigations, that the smaller retail trade throughout the country was soaked with falsehood through and through. Scarcely one article was sold in the shops frequented by the poor which was really the thing that it pretended to be.

These representations are not reproduced here in a censorious or hostile spirit. We have none but the kindliest feelings for the motherland. But it is due to America that it should be distinctly pointed out, that however grave her faults may be in this direction, she is far from being the only offender. There is a belief, especially popular in Europe, that the citizens of this republic are given to tergiversation, which is a polite word for trickery and evasion, and that among them this art has been carried to a higher degree of perfection than elsewhere. This discrimination

we resent. The evidence we have already cited proves that it is not for England to cast the first stone, and our observation of trade in other European countries satisfies us that they had all better leave the stoning business alone. They are none of them without sin. They are afflicted with just as many shrewd, cunning, manœuvering, conscienceless individuals as we are. While this much may be said in behalf of America, it is not designed to hide her culpability. Her people, if no worse than others, are no better, and she, in common with the rest of the world, needs to know how much of sham and legerdemain enter into her affairs. Willful ignorance on this subject is injurious. It not only adds another deception to the many we suffer from, but blinds to their pernicious influence, and so hands us over unresistingly to their corrupting and destroying power.

Human nature is easily imposed on. It trusts where it ought to doubt, and while it believes the greater portion of the race is liable to deception, it requires much stubborn evidence to convince its individual members that they are in danger. This marvelous self-confidence is unquestionably due to an abnormal kind of normal vanity; for it seems natural to men to be unnaturally satisfied with their powers of discernment, and to regard it as next to impossible for any one to delude them. And yet, while they stand looking smart and knowing, occasionally censuring those who are not wide enough awake to detect cheats, and exhibiting an assurance of manner which suggests that Gibralter is not more strongly fortified against enemies than they are, they are being poisoned by adulterated food, and are being dexterously fleeced on all sides. What is even more remarkable, many who have acquired wealth "by ways that are dark and tricks that are vain," are as oblivious apparently to retaliatory measures as though they were themselves innocent of any kind of sharp dealing. They

are perhaps of all others the most surprised, indignant and outraged when they discover that they themselves have been victimized. Language fails them; they take to denunciations; or, if they are piously inclined, they "wonder what the world is coming to," and conclude that the doctrine of depravity is unfortunately too true. The ease with which imposture succeeds, and our liability to be duped, may be inferred from the number of transparent frauds and humbugs which seek publicity, and which must have a market. Take this instance of our meaning from the pen of an eastern correspondent:

> There is an average in Boston of three "spiritual mejums" to every street. The charges are from $1 to $3 per sitting, with the chances of a chat with Aristotle, Plato, Cicero or Ben Franklin. If you think you get your money's worth, why you do. It is ever so nice not only to receive consoling messages from departed friends, but to be told every time you go what a wonderful and good fellow you are and how the world is just going back on itself and discounting itself at the rate of twenty per cent a minute in not recognizing and accepting you for what you really are, especially when the "mejum" is a young and pretty woman, and in the "trance condition" takes your hand in hers and calls you her "dear brother" for an hour or more, and sends you off home in a beatific condition from the story told of what wonderful things you are going to do when you are "developed."

There are also "Soothsayers," "Seventh daughters of a seventh daughter," "Astrologers," and "Medicine Men," and "Medicine Women," too, who can do all sorts of startling things, and who must enjoy considerable patronage to maintain them. We have all heard, and the trick is repeated almost daily, of good-looking, good-for-nothing youths, with greasy hair and affected manners, in some quarters supposed to be indisputable signs of European aristocracy, passing themselves off as lords and nobles, and succeeding, under various pretenses, in transferring lots of money from the pockets of stern, peerage-hating

republicans to their own. Some of these showy and attractive fictions even go further, and manage to entrap unsuspicious girls, whose democratic principles are not sufficiently strong to resist the fascinations of a title. And this recalls a most manifest piece of humbuggery, to which our attention was drawn in Europe, and which has been imitated after a fashion in this country. It is in the form of an advertisement, and reads and appears in this way:

MARRIAGES.—Several Princes, Dukes, Counts, Viscounts, wish to marry rich American Young Ladies. Write in the first instance in all confidence to Mme. La Baronne d'Emily, care of the "American Register," 2 Rue Scribe, Paris.

Naturally we asked, after looking over this "ad," as the printers would call it, can it be that there is a demand on the part of rich young American ladies for such articles of domestic furniture as dukes and counts? And if there is, can they really believe they can be purchased, and at prices proportionate to their rank? If they do, it reveals a stupendous amount of credulity, and if they do not, why does the amiable Baronne d'Emily take such pains, and go to such expense as she must when types and printers are enlisted to herald her beneficent mission to mankind? We are afraid we must conclude that she has reason for supposing that there are enough silly, sentimental, and gushing females in America who are ready to be gulled to afford her an ample support. She drives a trade at the expense of those who are already prepared to be deceived. Her enterprise, as we have intimated, has not been without copyists in this "home of the free," although it has not been pushed to the extent of offering for sale live princes and nobles. This, however, may arise from a laudable patriotism, which recognizes the Constitutional provision against titles, and which it cannot be expected that d'Emily, surrounded as she must be with counts and viscounts,

should at all take *account* of. In this land we are more unpretentious. We have matrimonial bureaus, where the solitary of either sex, for $3, can be brought into relations with eligible companions. A year ago the *Times* gave a telegraphic report of such an institution in New York, and during November (23, 1882) the *Tribune* published the operations of a similar establishment in Chicago. We have, of course, no way of estimating the amount of business transacted by these concerns, but we must suppose it to be sufficient to justify their existence, and the fact that they have patrons at all should satisfy us that human nature is essentially credulous, and should constantly be put upon its guard against the quackery, stratagems, ambuscades and misrepresentations by which it is hoaxed, befooled and betrayed.

A great deal has been said lately on the subject of adulteration, and if we may believe what is reported, we are daily swallowing an immense amount of trash which must impair and deteriorate health. Chalk cannot improve the quality of milk, neither can water add to its nourishing properties. Tea that has been dyed or colored with a preparation of copperas, or coffee that has been brought into unnatural fellowship with chicory, may be as palatable to the taste, but cannot be as advantageous to the body. Sugar that is charged with pulverized tombstones, and butter that is made out of fatty refuse from the slaughter-houses, and genuine olive oil manufactured from any and every other kind of oil except the olive, may not prove very disastrous, but they must fail to convince that the millenium is near at hand. In Switzerland they give honey which the bee has never hived; and at Chester we called once for Cheshire cheese, a cheese peculiar to that part of England, and when we had partaken with infinite relish, to our disgust we were told by the waiter that it was imported from America. But these petty cheats were harm-

less, save to their perpetrators, while those which we have hastily specified, and others like them, are injurious both to the seller and buyer, damaging the morals of the one and impairing the health of the other. An instance of this, to which attention has been called by the *Tribune*, deserves to be particularly noticed. A short time since that journal directed attention to the traffic in diseased meat, and makes this astounding and alarming statement:

It has been shown that the Chicago stock yards are the receptacle of countless thousands of pregnant, maimed, diseased and dying animals, which are as quickly as possible after arrival served to our people as food. Some pretense at inspection has been made, but those who are acquainted with the inner workings of the traffic know this inspection is but a farce, intended to give a false sense of security, while it may be made to line the purses of the chief performers.

Having suggested some measures against the evils of which the article complains, the paper continues:

Under such an arrangement those who bring to market superannuated and sickly old cows, ancient bulls tottering on the verge of dissolution, oxen which a generation ago should have retired from active service covered with well-earned laurels as they are now with bruises and galls, animals bearing hideous ulcers, exuding horrible matter, agonized brutes with flesh half cooked by burning fever from broken bones—all the dregs of a vast traffic, in short, would receive therefor its full value, probably more than they now get, for the ghouls who now fatten at the expense of their fellows would then be cut off from following their infamous calling.

Such an account as this is almost enough to make us forswear the use of animal food entirely, and to convert us to vegetarianism. It is enough to shake our confidence in the integrity and trustworthiness of human nature. If it is even proximately accurate, in what a heartless, savage age we live, when men can consent to grow rich by selling flesh afflicted with tuberculosis, cancer or tumor, and knowing that by so doing they are imparting these terrible diseases to their fellow-beings. No wonder, when such

reports are circulated here at home that France and Germany should be suspicious of our meat products, and should shut their ports against them. If dealers in provisions at times disgrace their calling by such nefarious practices, we may well believe that the men who trade in liquor, a trade which derives the bulk of its support from the worst classes of the community, and which is associated with crime and debauchery, do not hesitate to debase and poison the articles which they handle. Nor is this merely an inference. The venerable Dr. Eliphalet Nott has shown very clearly that "in London alone more port wine is drunk than is furnished by the entire vintage at Oporto; and yet London supplies the whole civilized world with port." Then the citizens of America may thoughtfully ask what they are drinking when they profess to be indulging in this delicious beverage. They may find an answer to their question in the following interesting extract from a Chicago paper :

A Paris dispatch to the London *Standard* says: "In 1881 there were 3,001 samples analyzed, the result being that 279 were found to be good, 991 passable, and 1,731 bad; while in the first five months of 1882 there were 1,869 samples analyzed, of which 372 were good, 683 passable, and 814 bad, 145 of the latter being very injurious." It is said that a liquid is largely sold for wine which is manufactured of water, vinegar and logwood, with a tenth part of common wine from the south of France to cover up the fraud. The same dispatch says: "Not only is wine falsified by adding cider, molasses, sugar, tartaric acid or tannic acid, sulphuric acid, lime, alum, bitter almonds, leaves of the cherry, laurel, etc., but it is largely manufactured without the slightest pretense of being associated with the grape." It is well for the admirers of French wines to know what French wines are.

Recently a New York paper has conducted with the aid of chemists an interesting investigation of the beer which is so generally used by the people. A St. Paul journal reports on the matter and comments in these terms:

It appears that cheratta root, chamomile flowers, gentian, quassia and aloes have all risen from ten to twenty per cent in price; but several drug importers in New York do not think that many brewers use cocculus indicus and nux vomica, which are very injurious. The doctors say that the use of tannin or aloes in excess is serious, while the use of nux vomica is very dangerous, and declare that any brewer found guilty of adulterating his beer with it ought to be prosecuted as a criminal. An excess of bicarbonate of soda, which some brewers are said to use to produce foam in beer, because customers prefer it to beer that does not foam, is harmful. One German doctor told the reporter that he would advise any healthy man to drink good imported German lager beer, but he couldn't prescribe the stuff which is made in this country. Another doctor said that many Germans were unable long to stand the drinking of American beer. It gave them headache, stomachache and many other aches. It brings on all kinds of trouble, from kidney disease to dropsy and fatty degeneration of the organs. All this, however, has reference to the wicked New York brewers. Just what the western manufacturers of lager beer are doing—if anything—to deteriorate the quality of their products cannot even be inferred, although there is a vast multitude of people who have a practical as well as theoretical interest in finding out. Or would they rather not?

We think it is very likely that they would prefer to remain in ignorance; and it is questionable whether they would believe were specific charges brought against the western dealer and fully substantiated. We shall not go into the inquiry therefore. We know that drink in Chicago maddens, degrades and prostrates as promptly and effectually as in New York; that it commits as many crimes and leads to as much sorrow; and consequently we are warranted in believing that it is as fatally "doctored" in the one place as in the other. Think of it, ye habitual topers; realize it, ye guzzlers and swillers of oceanic draughts, what a common sewer ye are making of your bodies, what a cesspool receptacle ye are making of your stomachs, into what a madhouse ye are converting your intellects, and into what a dumb, blind, driveling thing ye are changing your consciences, by the

liquid death, fermenting poison and fluid filth which you impoverish yourselves and beggar your families to procure. Oh, while there is an opportunity, if not altogether too late, at least thrust away this adulteration, which of all others is the most fatal to your happiness and welfare.

But there are other forms of imposition than those of adulteration, which, perhaps, need not be separately classified, though they should be noticed and rebuked. For instance, there are tricks of trade which do not involve any alteration for the worse of the articles sold, but which are just as contemptible. Dishonest balances may rarely be found, but carelessness in weighing, by which the customer gets less than he pays for, is not uncommon. It is said that at our stock yards there is an order of men called "shrinkers," whose business it is to see that the shippers of hogs get less money than their drove ought to bring. When the hogs are driven on the scales to be weighed, these men, or at least some of them, it is reported, in an arbitrary way announce the "shrinkage" which is to be "docked," and thus enrich their employer at the expense of the farmer; a species of chicanery, which recalls the case of an eastern carpet dealer, who acquired the reputation of giving scant measure, and who knew how to charge for more yards than were needed to cover any house he furnished. These are despicable arts; but unhappily they are matched by that lack of thoroughness and honesty which characterizes much of the work that is done in various departments of industry. The stitches of many tailors come out almost as fast as they are put in, and the cloth which has so superfine a finish often comes to an untimely end. Some dressmakers, like some tailors, are of easy conscience, and use of costly material for a lady's robe as much as would be required to clothe the huge proportions of the Kentucky giantess. Sewer builders and

plumbers do not enjoy a very savory name, for not a few of their craft compromise the rest by the way they slight their work. What they do is out of sight, and hence the temptation is great to put in inferior and inadequate pipes, to fail in making proper connections, and in a word, to have an eye to future business when attending to that of the present. In this weakness, however, they are not alone. Whenever anything is wrought which is not constantly visible, there comes the inducement to perpetrate some kind of cheat. We remember a row of houses in Boston whose foundations gave way; and we have seen walls go up there and elsewhere which would not require "the great wind from the wilderness," described by Job, to overthrow. A friend purchased an eider-down skirt in London from an established and leading dry goods house, and her distrustful maid ripped the sewing and found a cheap preparation of cotton inside. But there are impositions which are not the outgrowth of dishonest purpose, and which, if they do not seriously injure the morals, do the taste of Society. Some of these consist in base imitations, and others in disguising material of mean nature with the appearance of that which is of more value. Mock jewelry, sham diamonds, and the thousand and one shoddy articles which are in use belong to this class. But, perhaps, nowhere is it more deplorable than in masonry. We have good, honest brick churches painted to resemble stone, which are thus made ashamed of themselves; and we have all kinds of pretentious buildings which in their conspicuous parts are of granite or marble, and which in their obscure portions are composed of some inferior material. We sympathize with Ruskin in his horror of the unreal and false in architecture. We don't like a meeting-house with an elegant and massive *façade*, and with walls that are out of harmony; we don't like a club house which spoils the integrity of the struct-

ure by putting soft, cheap brick in the back elevation. A poet has said :

> They make the front just like St. Paul's,
> Or like Westminister Abbey.
> And then, as if to cheat the Lord,
> They leave the back part shabby.

Of course neither God nor man is deceived by these incongruities; neither may their authors intend to deceive, but they are pernicious nevertheless. They educate all who grow up near them in the deleterious belief that what is not seen may be slighted, that mongrel architecture is allowable, and that shams which are skillfully disguised are not, after all, such terrible affairs, and in other departments of work may be as harmless as in building. Much more wholesome and admirable, and even profitable, in every way, the course pursued by a young mechanic whose "immense capacity for taking trouble," as Carlyle would term it, is recorded in the following brief narrative, which we copy from a New York journal :

A prominent judge, living near Cincinnati, wishing to have a rough fence built, sent for a carpenter and said to him:

"I want this fence mended to keep out the cattle. There are some unplaned boards—use them. It is out of sight from the house, so you need not take time to make it a neat job. I will only pay you a dollar and a half."

However, afterward, the judge coming to look at the work, found that the boards were planed and the fence finished with exceeding neatness. Supposing the young man had done it in order to make a costly job of it, he said, angrily :

"I told you this fence was to be covered with vines. I do not care how it looks."

"I do," said the carpenter.

"How much do you charge?" asked the judge.

"A dollar and a half," said the man shouldering his tools.

"Why did you spend all that labor on the job, if not for money ? "

"For the job, sir."

"Nobody would have seen the poor work on it."

"But *I* should have known it was there. No; I'll take only the dollar and a half." And he took it and went away.

Ten years afterward the judge had a contract to give for the building of certain magnificent public buildings. There were many applicants among master-builders, but one face attracted attention. It was that of the man who had built the fence.

"I knew," said the judge, after telling the story, "we should have only good, genuine work from him. I gave him the contract, and it made a rich man of him,"

This examination would be unpardonably defective were we to pass by a class of impositions which, though having much in common with the instances already cited, differs from them in audacity, far-reaching rascality and unconscionable cunning. We refer to those peculiar operations carried on in the world of finance, which have for their special end the plundering of the government treasury or the pockets of the confiding people. The names of Edward E. Shaw, Levi D. Jarrard, Angler Chase, James D. Fish, Ward and others of the same stripe, indicate in what direction we would have our readers look. On the close of 1885 the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* published an instructive and melancholy article on the swindlers of monetary institutions. It gave their names, the amounts they had embezzled, their history and the term of their imprisonment. From this article we learn that there are upward of one hundred persons in fifteen of our penitentiaries who have defrauded or wrecked banks or misappriated trust-funds. These, however, are only the greater and more respectable offenders; for we learn from the same source that there are some one hundred and fifty others incarcerated whose stealings have been comparatively trifling. But when we remember that there are penitentiaries not heard from in the *Globe's* report, and that very likely there are multitudes of defaulters and rogues not yet exposed, we may form an idea of the im-

probity and knavishness which disgrace many commercial enterprises and which tend to render us suspicious of men and of corporations whose integrity and honor are really beyond reproach. A pamphlet entitled *Great Fortunes and Discontented Labor* increases this distrust by furnishing the public with an insight into the management of vast corporations which are made to enrich a few at the expense of the many. One extract from this trenchant economical tract will suffice to show how little security there really is in many bits of printed paper which pass for "securities":

As an example of some of the things complained of—A given railroad or telegraph line would cost, honestly built and equipped, say $10,000,000. The "promoters" get an act of incorporation, and issue the stock to themselves, "full paid," but not paid for at all. A franchise of enormous value to them, and sometimes of hurt to others, has been acquired. The stock not being paid for the road must be built with money raised on mortgage. The directors organize themselves into a "Construction Company," or a "Credit Mobilier," and get a contract for themselves, to themselves, to build the road for $15,000,000, and that amount of bonds must be issued, or more if sold at a discount. The "Construction Company," that is, the directors of the railroad company, pocket $5,000,000 profit. In a few years when repairs and a few unimportant additions have been made and paid for out of the earnings, the watering-hose is turned on; another $10,000,000 of stock is issued, and charged to "Construction Account," or some other road is leased, and the value of the lease is "represented" by the additional stock; though the lease was in consideration of payments or guarantees that more than represent its value. Now this company has a perfect right, if it can find the business, to make and declare a fair dividend on $10,000,000. But we now have $35,000,000 of bonds and stock for which interest and dividends must be provided. Who provides them? The robbed and plundered people who are "served" by the company. Six per cent on the fraudulent $25,000,000 levies a tribute of $1,500,000 per annum on the people. This thing in substance, not in this precise form, nor in these precise figures, is going on all the time, all over the country.

Comment on this state of affairs would be superfluous,

and would undoubtedly prove exceedingly offensive to some exalted people, who are courted by exclusive circles, and who boast of their aristocratic family. We shall not chafe them by enlarging on the subject; for they can readily imagine how extensively such expressions as "double dealing," "trickery," "breach of faith," "unfairness," would enter into any criticism of ours. But in view of this disreputable scheming we ought not to be surprised at the discoveries recently made of gigantic land frauds, perpetrated by the same class of speculators. The "manipulation" or "watering" of stock prepares us to expect the confiscation of the public domain by any who can lay hands on it successfully. A *chevalier d'industrie* in France is not very particular what he grabs; neither is he in America providing the booty is worth an effort. And that it is in this case may be gathered from Commissioner Sparks' report, which the Chicago *Tribune* substantially reproduces, and which we quote here:

> The report of the commissioner of the general land office sums up a general list of land frauds and presents the astounding total of 10,000,000 acres illegally seized by railroads, to say nothing of the tracts secured by cattle companies and others engaged in the spoilation of the public domain. It has been a matter of general notoriety that frauds of this character were carried on systematically for many years, but still few were prepared for the assertion that the government had been tricked and swindled out of 10,000,000 acres by the railroads alone. The land grabbers appear to have had full swing, while the government and the settlers had no rights to be defended. The land-sharks seized large tracts under fraudulent titles, or with none at all, and then patrolled the country with armed cowboys, and in some instances secured the help of the United States army to drive off honest settlers.

Now let it not be forgotten that most of the men concerned in this "public land robbery" are persons of high social standing, some of them attendants on churches and that defection from the strict law of probity on their part

must be indicative of a very loose conception of moral obligation generally. Undoubtedly the inference is fair, and what can be more alarming than for a nation to become mere phantasms of honesty and despicable worshipers of shams?

Naturally we are impelled by these reflections to think of the worst form of the evil we are studying—the meretricious, the artificial and the insincere in character. These contemptible qualities are met with in every circle, and display themselves in the drawing-room, in the club, in the political canvass and the religious meeting. Duplicity genteel and refined, elegant and devout, exhibits itself side by side with duplicity low and coarse, rude and blasphemous. The infidel in his zeal to make good his cause may say far more than his convictions warrant, and the minister may be, even though a hypocrite, less of a hypocrite than he. Politicians study the art of adaptation, and know how to adjust themselves and their speeches to the whims of their supporters. Such cases as these are familiar to all, and are worthily despised. But there is a larger class, where there is no intentional subterfuge, which is constantly falling into little equivocations, shufflings, dissimulations and reservations. We find it difficult to be just what we are, and say what we think in Society constituted as it is. There are proprieties which must not be outraged; there is what is called public sentiment, which must not be disregarded; there is etiquette which exacts punctilious homage, and customs innumerable which demand respectful attention; and between them all men and women are shaped into the merest semblance of themselves. The desire to avoid being odd and grotesque, and the wish to be distinguished by manners, breeding and courtly style, combined with a dread of criticism from those who sneer at everything rustic, boorish and clownish, and who denounce a departure from "good

form" more vehemently than a departure from good morals, tends toward affectedness, dandyism and foppishness. Hence we have a host of men who are exquisites, coxcombs and beaux, and who present in themselves only the burlesque of manhood. The social code likewise compels us to bow to those whom we do not respect, to shake hands with those whom we would be pleased to thrash, to regret the withdrawal of one whom we have inwardly prayed might depart, and to request the speedy return of those whom we rather hope we shall never see again, not even in eternity.

No wonder in view of these insincerities that Mrs. Browning sings, and that some of us echo the sad refrain:

"Some respect for social fictions
Hath been also lost by me;
And some generous genuflexions,
Which my spirit offered free
To the pleasant old conventions of our false humanity."

Nor is this the worst type of character, bad as it is, which results from the prevalence of shameless shrewdness, shabby shams and showy shoddy in modern life. The success of impositions, and the simplicity and gullibility of the crowd combined with an undemocratic love of fulsome praise, have produced that most inflated, arrogant and unveracious specimen of humanity—The Demagogue. He is, as Artemus Ward would say, "unfortunately very numerous," even as he is very shallow and absurd. Let us attempt his portrait. It ought not to be hard to paint, as the original is not far to find. He is one whose religious belief is expressed by the proverb, *vox populi vox Dei*. He entertains, or pretends to entertain, great reverence for the people. The multitude practically represent the majesty of heaven, and he seeks most devoutly to trim his sails to their divergent humors. He knows no other object of worship; and though the vocif-

eration of the Athenians for the death of Socrates, and the louder cry of the Jews for the official murder of Jesus, and the vehement demand of the Parisians for the Guillotine; and though Shakespeare has shown by the experience of Menenius Agrippa and by the indignation of Coriolanus, that the human voice is far from always being the voice Divine, he has never dreamt of any higher creed. This was Robespierre's faith. He claimed that the masses could not seriously err; and he was a chief among demagogues, and by his death furnished one of the few sound arguments in favor of their infallibility—they sent him where he had sent so many, to the scaffold. In this instance, at least, we may admit the *vox populi vox Dei.*

Were demagogues in reality benefactors, we would have no word of criticism to offer. But they are not. The end of their faith is their own promotion. They are generally a singular composition of selfishness, self-conceit and self-delusion. There are silly demagogues and wicked demagogues; but they are all self-infatuated, self-contained and self-seeking. They simply use the people as stepping-stones to power, as some so-called religious persons use Christ as a convenient way to heaven, to be adopted when all the joys of earth have been exhausted. If the multitudes, when they are lauded, extolled and fondled, are deceived, they need not be surprised; for though it is an ungrateful thing to say, it is true, that they are being led by designing men as sheep to the slaughter. They who thus rise at their expense, entertain the profoundest admiration for their own abilities. Your real demagogue has confidence in his "star," believes in the singular greatness of his destiny, and considers himself equal to anything. He regards himself as many-sided—feels that posterity will desire to know his movements and his thoughts, and so keeps a journal, records his speeches, sometimes builds his own sepulcher, and inscribes thereon an account of his

many virtues. If he happens to be a preacher, he is familiar with the Almighty, speaks without misgivings of his plans and purposes, and waves with lofty supercilious-ness all who differ from him and his adherents into a place of sorrow and despair. If he is a politician, he considers himself essential to the well-being of the nation, assumes that his cunning is wisdom, that his office-seeking is patriotism, that his assertions are arguments, and that his projects are public benefactions. If he is a physician, a lawyer, a merchant — for he is a possibility in every profession — he is heady, arrogant, patronizing; a boasting, windy braggart, who, like the philosopher, sees nothing great but man, and unlike the philosopher, sees no man great but himself. His self-conceit is always shoreless, oceanic, Titanic, and engulfs in its depths every trace of modesty and humility, and beats down or swallows up nearly everything that is valuable in human nature. He knows how to cringe when he has purposes to serve; he knows how to forget the obligations he is under to those around him; and he knows how to veer with the facility of the weathercock. And he is sufficiently adept in sophistry, and oblivious enough to everything save his own advancement, to reconcile his deviations and schemings with the sense of his own importance and dignity.

If we may credit newspaper reports of him, John Swinton, the Socialist, if not a full-fledged demagogue, is at least one in embryo. We refer to him, not because we are animated by unkind feelings toward John, or because we are acquainted with him and dislike him. He may be, and very likely is, a man of estimable qualities, but the accounts of him we have seen, and especially the one to which we desire to refer, are not favorable to the soundness of his judgment or the thoroughness of his reforming efforts. To us he is little more than a myth, and we take the liberty of introducing him to our readers because he

illustrates the facility with which men, who may really desire to be helpful, fall into superficial and misleading arts, and pander to the prejudices of the unthinking and discontented. John, it seems, attended a labor picnic at Troy, N. Y., and during the festivities made a speech. He pictured the homes of the shrunken, shriveled, sunken-eyed and hollow-cheeked children of toil, who had built the great mills which add so much to the prosperity of the beautiful city where they eke out a meager subsistence. Viewing what he regarded as an injustice, he reminded his hearers that those who built the mills did not own them, and proceeded in indignant tones to propound the following questions: "How did the property get into the hands of the Cornings and Burdens? How did that land get into Corning's hands where poor Strang was killed?" The kind of answers he anticipated to these queries, which fairly hiss with insinuations, we can readily surmise; but the reply made by the Troy *Times* was certainly very different from what he expected. In quoting from its columns, we want it distinctly understood that we have no personal acquaintance with the Cornings and Burdens, and that they are as mythical to us as John himself.

Fifty years ago or more there came to Troy a poor Scotch emigrant. He was honest, industrious, temperate and frugal. He was a master of his trade—that of an iron-worker. He started a little shop on the Wynantskill. His skill in handicraft succeeded in attracting business to him. His little shop grew from its humble beginnings to works of mammoth proportions, giving employment to hundreds of men, enabling the operatives to care for wives, children and other dependent ones, and helping to build up here at Troy one of the great seats of wealth, population and industry. When other men were wasting their substance in dissipation, he was saving the fruits of his labor and investing it in new enterprises for the benefit of humanity in general. When other men were sleeping, he was spending his nights in his workshop or in his study, elaborating inventions to lighten labor and dignify the laborer. He died a rich man; but he had earned every dollar of his vast estate by industry,

enterprise and honest dealing with his fellow-men. He transmitted his factories and mills to his sons, and they have gone on enlarging and adding to them until to-day the Burden works are celebrated all over the country, not alone for their extent, but for the superior character of the productions they place upon the markets of the world. That is the way, John Swinton, a portion of the property you speak of came into the possession of the Burden family.

And of Erastus Corning the *Times* says :

Erastus Corning, the founder of the Corning estate, was a man like unto Mr. Burden. He went to Albany a poor boy, became a merchant, lived soberly, uprightly, dealt justly with his fellow-men. By years of industrious application to business he amassed a fortune; he invested in iron mills and railroad enterprises, and by that means he helped to make Troy a prosperous city and New York the Empire State of the Union. The democratic party in its better days sent him to congress to make laws for the nation, and he made them well. His son is no unworthy scion of an illustrious sire. That is the way the Corning works came into possession of the Corning family, John Swinton.

Whether John profited by the reply or not we have no means of knowing; but it is one that deserves to be pondered by working people all over the land. It indicates that success depends on sobriety, self-control and industry. Even coöperative schemes, highly as they should be valued, can never be made effective aside from these sterling qualities. He who talks in such a way as to obscure this obvious truth, is no real friend to any one. He may mean to be a helper, but he is in fact a deceiver; for he is encouraging the belief that some new order of Society can supersede the necessity for hard, intelligent and well-directed toil. This is a fatal illusion, and the wider it is spread the greater the shiftlessness of wage-workers, and the more numerous their evasions, neglects and impositions. And as the result of questionings such as these of John Swinton we have a trend toward sullen, discontented idleness, organizing itself in strikes and leading to malodorous political nostrums and pretentious

economical quackery. Into such pitfalls of artificiality are our demagogues leading the people; and the more attention they give them the further will they depart from those veracious conditions which are alike indispensable to the prosperity of individuals and nations.

At times it seems as though Society were eaten through and through with falsehood, as though it were rapidly becoming one mountainous lie, and must necessarily fall to pieces of its own unveracity. It seems as though it must poison itself by its endless quackeries and circumvent itself by its manifold conjurations, and ruin itself by its protean charlatanisms. If it is saved government must do all that law can do to protect the citizen against fraud. And in this direction its labors can easily be made effectual. Let us not forget that it is invested with this responsibility, and if it fails, it is due either to the inadequacy of the statute or the feebleness of the executive. Defects in either direction should be promptly corrected, and they can be if the people are anxious to put an end to impositions. Inspection of food, inspection of liquor, yea, inspection in almost every branch of industry is imperatively demanded; and the obligation that every article sold shall be distinctly marked so as to prevent swindling needs to be impartially enforced. While we speak thus and believe to this extent in government interference, and believe it practical, yet we know that it will never prove successful until the moral sentiment of the people themselves upholds it and insists upon it. And this will never be until their avarice abates, and the foolish ambitions by which they are swayed decline. At present they are anxious to be rich, they are intent on social standing; and in their hurry and competition they do not consider very carefully the means they should employ. How can this evil spirit, which is at the root of all our crooked growths, be exorcised? Not by statute, certainly. Legislatures and legislative enactments never yet

have regenerated a nation, and never can. Law cannot probe deep enough, nor can it implant in the heart reverence for the rights of others. Here is a work that religion must perform, and which, if religion, according to the crazy programme of the secularists, is destroyed, must forever remain undone. Christianity is in reality our chief dependence. She comes from heaven protesting against unveracity, preaching a Savior who is Himself the Truth, seeking to lead us into all truth, and delivering us from bondage to lies. This is her mission, and in proportion as it is successful must all forms of imposture have an end.

She denounces guile with unfaltering and uncompromising fidelity; and that the world may realize how vain and foolish every kind of false-dealing is, she represents it as being brought at last before the tribunal of Him who will weigh all deeds in His balances and judge all righteously. It is also written in the Book which contains the brightest expression of her spirit that "a just weight is His delight," and that He will test us thereby. One place evidently there is in His great universe where sham, shoddy and deceit will be valued according to their true worth, and where the "refuge of lies" shall be destroyed. We need not tell you that that spot is where the Almighty shall institute impartial inquiry, and shall reward according to the deeds done in the body. You may remember the scene in Daniel's Prophecy, typical of the final Judgment Day, when the King sees the handwriting on the wall, and hears the interpretation which declares that he has been weighed and has been found wanting. God still holds the balances, and every hour we are in the scales; and when life closes He will announce the decision — a decision that shall rank us forever either with the true or false. Though none may know it now, all shall know it then, and if the lips of Justice shall then say "wanting,"

angels and saints shall see that we have been a shadow, a chimera, equivocal and misleading, and must troop with our unveracities into a most real perdition.

VII.

THE DIVISIONS OF SOCIETY.

The ignorance, stupidity, the hate,
Envy and malice and uncharitableness,
That bar your passage, break the flow of you
Down from those happy heights where many a cloud
Combined to give you birth, and bid you be
The royalist of rivers : on you glide,
Silvery till you reach the summit-edge ;
Then over, on to all that ignorance,
Stupidity, hate, envy, bluffs and blocks,
Posted to fret you into foam and noise.
What of it? Up you mount in minute mist,
And bridge the chasm that crushed your quietude,
A spirit rainbow, earth-born jewelry
Outsparkling the insipid firmament,
Blue above Terni and its orange-trees.
Do not mistake me ! You, too, have your rights,
Hans must not burn Kant's house above his head
Because he cannot understand Kant's book ;
And still less must Hans' pastor burn Kant's self
Because Kant understands some books too well.

—*Robert Browning*

THE Jews and the Samaritans hated each other sincerely and vigorously. They excommunicated each other heartily, and having no dealings together on earth, anticipated also equally satisfactory exclusiveness in heaven. Mount Gerizim and Mount Moriah were in perpetual antagonism until the fires of both altars were extinguished by the sacrificial love of Jesus Christ. The bigotry of these old communities recalls a story related by Herbert Spencer, in which rivalries as senseless and as proscrip-

tive are chronicled. Abd-el-Latref, of Wahhabee, recounted to the people of Riad one day the tradition according to which Mahomet declared that his followers should divide into seventy-three sects, and that seventy-two were destined to hell-fire and only one to Paradise. This one fortunate sect should be composed of those who conformed to the example of the prophet. "And this happy sect are we," added the preacher, in tones of deepest conviction. Time has been when some Christians have not hesitated to express themselves as dogmatically regarding the doom of those who differed from them in opinion as the Wahhabee; and though that time has passed, there are yet denominations whose sectarianism is an offense to the purest and noblest thought of the age and whose petty animosities, wretched jealousies and profitless controversies constitute one of the most formidable obstacles to the triumph of Christianity. And as though this disunity were not sufficiently mortifying, within the limits of each particular denomination, and in almost every local church, variance, discord and schism frequently appear to the discomfort and discredit of all concerned, and to the intense satisfaction of those who have no confidence whatever in religion. Among the Greeks, it is said, the island of Delos was consecrated to peace, but we know of no such spot permanently respected by the followers of Him who is called the "Prince of Peace," and who came to create the fellowship of love. Instead, there are "wars and rumors of wars," numerous cliques, coteries, cabals; and with them bickering, squabbling, wrangling and disruption.

Such being the state of affairs in the most sacred of all domains, it is not surprising that parties should appear elsewhere. They cast their shadows on us from a venerable age, and still darken our way. The history of ancient Rome is largely a record of acts similar to the crime that crimsoned her foundations with blood.

Romulus causes his brother Remus to be slain, and throughout the subsequent annals of the city we seem to see the repetition of the fratricidal cruelty which disgraced her origin. Plots, counterplots, conspiracies, civil war and assassination are the commonplaces of her career; and, as though the evil spirit from which they sprang would not down, even in mediæval times the feuds of the Colonna and the Orsini constantly jeopardized her safety, just as the contests between the Ghibellini and the Guelfi, and between the Bianchi and the Neri, distracted Florence. And what is true of Italy is likewise true of other countries. From the Danube to the Rhine, from the Rhine to the Seine, and from the Seine to the Thames and the Tweed, little else was heard for weary centuries save the clang of arms, the tramp of the predatory chief and the noise of battle. The fighters in the field were but a part of a greater host of fighters in the courts of kings and in the palaces of the nobles. Statesmen, barons, princes and burghers were constantly scheming against each other, and doing their best to hold their own or advance their personal interests at each other's expense; and when their word-conflicts failed to reach a decided issue, through their partisans they appealed to sturdier measures. Thus in the past, the whole world wore the air of a beleaguered camp, and the spirit of discord reigned. Nor is it very different in the present. The forms and appliances have indeed changed, but there seems to be about as much strife as ever. Society is still divided, and almost endlessly sub-divided. There is, perhaps, no party but has one or more parties within itself; and it seems next to impossible to get any reasonable number of persons to see alike on any subject. There are in this country two great political bodies, but these are rent by internal dissensions. The Democrats are distracted by their Irving Hall, their Tammany Hall factions, and by

their extreme and moderate wings ; while the Republicans are equally disturbed by their "stalwarts" on the one side and their "debilitates" on the other. The community is distinguished by the terms "rich and poor"; but we all know that these classes are simply genera under which the most diverse species are distributed. Even the affluent members of community do not constitute one happy family. There are those who affect intellectuality, and who regard with something akin to scorn those who devote themselves to fashion ; and there are yet others in this plebeian nation who pride themselves on the aristocracy of their birth, and like the Jews, have no dealings with the prosperous Samaritans who were born of an inferior and mongrel stock. The indigent, likewise, are not an unbroken brotherhood, feeling in common, and seeing eye to eye. Leaving out of sight the primary distinction of worthy and unworthy poor, and holding ourselves to the former order, we find that it is not undisturbed by rivalries, jousts and squabbles. For instance, there are many who are heartily ashamed of their connection with the impoverished, and who by divers arts seek to create the impression that they are above their class, and are really treated with marked consideration by their social superiors ; and there are others who despise this base spirit of compromise, and who indulge in fierce invectives and coarse threats against all who have been so unfortunate as to be fortunate in this world's goods. When such persons attempt organization for the furtherance of their own interests, whether called "Leagues," "Trade-Unions," or "Internationals," the tendency toward segregation is painfully apparent. Factions start up almost immediately and do much to nullify the good which judicious combinations might otherwise effect. Man is arrayed against man ; fellow-workmen cannot harmonize their views ; leaders are suspected of sel-

fishness; clashing policies are urged on administrations; and as much cunning, bitterness and unscrupulousness are displayed in the feuds of labor as in the altercations between labor and capital. Indeed, so far is this spirit carried that were we as a nation prepared for a change of government, and were we to commit its formation to those who call themselves "Socialists," it would be impossible for them to agree. A convention of such persons though answering to a common name, would not preserve the peace for a day, and speedily would be shivered into contending parties. Great diversity exists in their ranks, and the effort to unite them in a congress for the adoption of new principles of political action would undoubtedly end in a noisy row. If our position is challenged let it be tested. Bring all the branches of Socialism together and let them draw up a Constitution and by-laws for the alleged coming Republic if they can. We have a right to know what they propose. If they are hopelessly divided among themselves they cannot expect outsiders to do otherwise than stand by the old order. That they are thus divided such a meeting as we propose would effectively demonstrate. This, however, is not said to disparage the lowly; for as we have already intimated, their inability to join forces is paralleled in other circles. Everywhere it exists. In the chamber of commerce there will be variance, in the cabinet of a nation there will be dissension, in the conferences of pastors, the associations of teachers, and the fellowships of temperance advocates there will be disputes, jarrings and ruptures; and even in guilds of artists, troupes of performers, and in companies of musicians there will oftentimes be jealousies, contentions and struggles, which sadly illustrate the inadequacy of studies in harmonies of color and sound to preserve the harmonies of life. All men, or nearly all, alike seem to be afflicted with a disputatious spirit. They desire to coalesce, seek

to combine, and then fall to wrangling. Strikingly they illustrate the two supreme forces in the universe—the centripetal and the centrifugal; for they are ever trying to draw closer together, and then are flying away from the center. Divisions, therefore, in the present condition of humanity may be looked for as inevitable. "The eleventh juryman" is irrepressible. Like the ghost of Banquo he will rise up "to push us from our stools." Disunity will go hand in hand with unity; and until the race is radically changed the prospect of seeing eye to eye must be regarded as exceedingly dim and shadowy.

That rivalries, in many respects, have proven advantageous to Society cannot successfully be denied. Agitations at times have appeared to promote its advancement. Debate and battle seem to be conditions of its progress. From the *Eros* and *Anteros*, attraction and repulsion, of the old Greek philosophy, something more seems to be born than mere physical order and well-being. "The struggle for existence," and "the survival of the fittest," are doctrines not without illustrations in the evolution of civilization. As God "answered Job out of the whirlwind," so the divine in man, and in Society as well, slowly emerges from the strife and storm of clashing systems, antagonistic desires, and irreconcilable ambitions. Greater whirlwind than this even the Almighty never spoke from; and we can conceive of none on sea or land more terrific or more powerful. As the mountain tempest charged with summer heat melts the snows of Switzerland and renders possible the harvest; and as the gales that rage and blow, wrecking vessels on the lakes and uprooting strong trees in the forest, sweeps malaria from our fields and streets, so the controversies and discords of humanity have saved the world from icy stagnation, barrenness and corruption. "See!" writes Browning—

Where winter re'gned for ages,—by a turn
I' the time, some star-change (ask geologists)
The ice-tracts split, crash, splinter and disperse,
And there's an end of immobility.

* * * * * * *

What result?
New teeming growth, surprises of strange life,
Impossible before, a world broke up
And remade, order gained by law destroyed.
Not otherwise, in our society,
Follow like portents, all as absolute
Regenerations.

We shall not attempt to illustrate how strife brings in higher and nobler forms of life. But it is important that we should realize the possibility and peril of perverting this principle and of abusing it to our own undoing. It may be carried to excess, and be made the source of unmitigated evil to the entire community; for it may assume such a character and breathe such a spirit as to endanger the very progress, which in more favorable circumstances it would promote. We need, therefore, to note these phases of what enters so largely into human affairs, that such defects and extremes may be avoided.

First, divisions degenerate into a positive curse when they beget and foster prejudice. Commonly they do this; not of course in the same degree, nor always in the same way; but just in proportion as they do so at all they defeat the end they might otherwise subserve. Mr. Herbert Spencer has given some idea of the extent to which this vice prevails, and has indicated in his *Study of Sociology* the almost insurmountable barriers it rears in the way of improvement. Among other examples he cites the opposition of clergymen to the corn-laws, and of army officers to the abrogation of the purchase system, an antagonism in both instances inconsistent with these professions, and which could only have been prompted by narrow and contracted views. He

also refers to the dismissal of Mr. Cowan by the Indian Government for executing without form of law some Koska rioters who had surrendered. This, as he remarks, was "not excessive punishment," and yet it was denounced as an outrage by Sir Donald McLeod, who felt as an Indian officer that his class had been affronted by the decision. In contrast with this, Mr. Spencer publishes the following extract from a daily paper:

> Five poisoned foxes have been found in the neighborhood of Penzance, and there is consequently great indignation among the western sportsmen. A reward of £20 has been offered for information that shall lead to the conviction of the poisoner.

And justly adds, "so that wholesale homicide, condemned alike by religion, by equity, by law, is approved, and the mildest punishment of it is blamed; while vulpicide, committed in defense of property, and condemned neither by religion nor by equity, nor by any law save that of sportsmen, excites an anger that cries aloud for positive penalties." In both cases "the class bias," as our philosopher calls it, begets a deep-seated prejudice which blinds to the claims of humanity, and leads to manifest injustice. He likewise points out how long it takes for the most wholesome and vital discovery to obtain recognition, how conservatism in favor of what has been looks with suspicion on the new, and fails to give due consideration to what is advanced in its favor. It took the English Admiralty two centuries to adopt for use in the navy sour juices, though it had been demonstrated over and over again that their absence from the fleet led to scurvy and to mortality exceeding the mortality of battle, and of all sea-casualties taken together. The East India Company required sixty years to deliberate on the wisdom of approving in its service the use of ipecacuanha, a remedy to which the attention of Europeans was called as early as 1648. And we may gather from the history of all discoveries and

inventions the extreme reluctance of those whose theories and interests they seemed to compromise to give them a candid investigation. The laboring classes have frequently opposed the employment of machinery; and even lately in America, Herr Most, a German Socialist, has advocated its destruction; and Moody has boldly challenged its value. Strange that such sentiments should find utterance! Machinery has lightened many a burden, has tended to shorten the hours of toil, and gives promise of even larger blessings to the world. Only the most inexcusable prejudice growing out of inveterate enmity to the capitalist can explain the mad desire to have its powers arrested. Charles Sumner in a speech on "Progress" has shown that even the introduction of stage coaches into England was seriously objected to on the ground that they would make men careless to attain good horsemanship, hinder the breed of watermen and lead to other evils; and that steamboats and railroads were likewise opposed as delusions and impositions, and that the old Greenwich pensioners especially objected to the former, because, as they used to say, "the steamboat is so contrary to nature." In all of these cases there appears the same indisposition to admit the force of evidence, and the same attachment to standards, traditions and parties, which still hamper and impede every movement in favor of social improvement. Gas corporations cannot see any hope of practical benefit from the electrical light; and other monopolies will not consent to the possibility of anything desirable springing from that which promises to be a rival. Labor never fairly estimates the position and rights of capital; and capital rarely does justice to the needs and claims of labor. They come to the discussion of all questions between them in the blindness of heated partisanship, and hence satisfactory results are rarely reached. Aristocracy fails to perceive plebeian worth, as it is profoundly engaged in contemplating its

own excellence; and plebeianism is unfair in its criticisms of aristocracy, never having taken time for anything else save the study of its own sufferings. Were they only better acquainted with each other, their recriminations would not be as fierce as they are; and if they would only take pains to abate their prejudices, they could and would coöperate to promote the welfare of Society.

Secondly, divisions become a positive evil when they lead to detraction and invective. The Bible very earnestly urges the necessity and importance of courtesy. "Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love, in honor preferring one another," is the apostolic precept, a precept which is frequently ignored even by ecclesiastics. We have accounts of church trials where the language of Zion degenerates into Billingsgate, where the judges threaten each other with personal violence, and where studied efforts are made to blacken the character of witnesses. Thoughtful Christians hesitate to arraign even the most culpable; for they dread the result on the congregation. They know it will most likely create parties, and that if it does, there is not enough conscientiousness among the disciples of Jesus Christ to prevent the parties from having recourse to backbiting, obloquy, and defamation. They therefore prefer to leave the guilty alone rather than provoke a storm of scurrility, which they know full well will surely prove disastrous to the peace and prosperity of the church. Outside of religious circles this offense against decency and the best interests of mankind is very common. We have been painfully impressed with its prevalence in English political life. To one familiar with the personal worth and eminent services of Mr. Gladstone, it seems incredible that the Opposition would condescend to employ base and scandalous terms in speaking of him. Yet that such is the case one conversant with "Tory" journals cannot doubt. He is libeled, lampooned,

depreciated and calumniated without hesitancy and without apology. But the "Tory" papers have not the monopoly of this detestable business. The "Liberals" sin just as gravely against propriety. A London evening publication devoted to the interests of the former party called attention three summers ago to the peccadilloes in this respect of the latter:

It is a stereotyped complaint with Liberal journals that the wicked Tories speak and write abusively of Mr. Gladstone. Whether the allegation be true or not, the accused might well resort to a *tu quoque* argument. Here, for instance, we have the *Western Morning News*, a paper which affects to be moderate and dispassionate, giving admission to a letter the scurrility of whose language could not easily be surpassed. Merely because Sir Samuel Baker had ventured to write that, "if the government act quickly and with determination, all England will follow them with a spirit which, though long dormant, is still alive," he is charged with acting "in a thoroughly mean and pitiful manner," and with repeating "the utterly untruthful and oft-contradicted slander of his party." But Sir Samuel comes off lightly in comparison with Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Salisbury, and the party generally. "Dizzy," as the writer, with charming familiarity, styles the greatest minister England has had for many a year, is charged with having uttered "an unspeakably vile and heartless lie" when he used the phrase "coffee-house babble" to describe the monstrous exaggerations of the Bulgarian atrocity agitations. Lord Salisbury is "that convicted prince of liars;" the Conservatives are "the lying party:" finally it is laid to the charge of Lord Beaconsfield that, when he dined at the Mansion house, "he feasted at the cost, and out of the taxation of the impoverished Londoners."

Of course this kind of political journalism can be easily matched in America. Perhaps in all the world there is no press more skilled in the use of opprobrious and vituperative epithets than a section of our own. In a sense far different from that intended by Tennyson, it reaches "the abysmal depths of personality," and agrees with Dr. Johnson in believing that any stick is good enough to beat a dog with, and that every adversary is a dog to be beaten. The *Saturday Review* (March 23,

1878) thus quotes the famous doctor and his admirer Boswell on this subject: "Treating your adversary with respect," said the former, "is giving him an advantage to which he is not entitled. The greatest part of men cannot judge by reasoning, and are impressed by character, so that, if you allow your adversary a respectable character, they will think that, though you differ from him, you may be in the wrong. Sir, treating your adversary with respect is striking soft in battle"; the latter carried "the theory beyond character, to personal appearance, and held that if an antagonist was an ugly dog, and thought himself handsome, these facts would be perfectly relevant in an argument about final causes or any other topic." These seem to be the sentiments which to no small degree govern political journalism in America as in Europe, and hence with every election we have the most villanous charges brought against our public men. They have connived with others to defraud the electors; they have been guilty of bribery; they have sympathized with "whiskey frauds," or with "Star Route" thieves; they have plundered the public treasury, and, according to printed representations, are better qualified for the penitentiary than for Congress or the White House. It may be said that many of our great dailies and small dailies, merely overstate things and fall into exaggerations. It should be hoped that they do; for if they do not, Rome at its worst was not further gone in moral corruption than we. But this is the very point of the censure; they *do* overstate, and in doing so encourage the most vicious elements of community to lift up hands in holy wonder at the wickedness of the men who are honored with social position, and to murmur at the injustice which is shown them in threatening them with jails, when those who are greater transgressors are chosen to high political office. The influence of such journalism is demoralizing. It attaches odium to

the public service; and as it is pursued recklessly and indiscriminately it comes to be looked on as a matter of course and crooked politicians are neither abashed nor injured by it; while those who are honest are simply disgusted, and for the sake of place are unwilling to run a muck with a host of conscienceless scribblers. Of course there are notable exceptions to this reprehensible mode of conducting newspaper controversy. Not a few of our editors would scorn to disgrace their columns with the vile slanders that are published elsewhere. They do not hesitate to denounce wrong, and to reprove corruption; but they are not venal enough to write an opponent "scoundrel" for the mere sake of party success and the advantages it may bring to them financially or politically.

But while we condemn the spirit of detraction and invective in the press, let us not overlook its presence elsewhere. If a Communistic Association gathers, as a rule it straightway gives itself to noise, bluster, and fierce phillipics, threatening murder and arson, and invoking the Eumenides—Tisiphone, Megara, and Alecto—to vent their fury on the heads of those who happen to have worldly possesssions; and if a company of traders sink money through the greater enterprise, skill and brains of another—as, for instance, the "bulls" and the "bears" on "change"—not uncommonly the losing party denounces the winning party as liars and thieves; and if reformers of any class come together they are very apt to denounce those who only differ from them in method and not in aim, as Dr. Crosby of New York has been by some small, self-conceited, and intemperate Boston temperance agitators, almost in the same terms of censure as they would legitimately employ when characterizing the avowed supporters of the liquor traffic. Now this is not only unjust, it is also unwise. By whomsoever

employed and in whatever cause violence, bitterness, and detraction are baneful. They arouse indignation in the minds of those who differ, and unfit them to weigh calmly any suggestions that may be offered. By them men are driven farther apart than ever, suspicion and unkind feelings are developed, and the entire community becomes harsh in its judgments and unlovely in its temper.

Thirdly, we shall find divisions to be hurtful and mischievous when they promote arrogance and self-conceit. We meet with this peculiar weakness very frequently in Society, especially among some of those who have attained to sudden riches. The first symptom of their sublime superciliousness is the loss of their memory, which they never recover. They forget and wish every one else to forget their humble origin. One New York millionaire said to another, cynically desiring to recall his obscure start in life, "This elegant party is better than selling peanuts"; to which the other replied sarcastically, "Peanuts are as good as pies." Evidently neither of them could afford to throw stones. Both of them had made their own fortune and were ashamed to acknowledge the fact. Their parents were lowly people as yours were, or your grandparents, most aristocratic reader, and to blush for them is unworthy you. It is as foolish as the exclusiveness attempted in some quarters. We say "foolish" and we might say unjust, for while there will always be cliques and fraternities founded on kindred tastes and excellences, the exclusiveness to which we refer is devoid of justification. It draws distinctions on the ground of money, and it affects to thrust the toilers of the world into a class by themselves, and to treat them as though of inferior rank and worth. The do-nothings, the affluent idlers, frown on those who have to work as though they were of a lower race. The *Art Interchange* gives a sample of this spirit in an article which furnishes food for serious reflection:

The congregation of a fashionable New York church is just at present energetically discussing the question of "ought we to visit her," a large majority of the members, it is reported, inclining to the negative. The "her" in this case is the mother of their pastor, a woman of irreproachable moral character and unobtrusive manners. Although no fault can be found with her manners or her morals, she has in the past been guilty of that which determines a society of Christians to withhold from her the ordinary courtesies of social life. Her offense is that, in former days, in order to support herself and a family of children, she pursued the calling of a washerwoman and a people which worships the son of a carpenter, refuses to extend social recognition to a worthy woman who by the faithful performance of lowly duties has aided her son to attain his present honorable position.

This is an illustration of the spirit exhibited by society toward women who are compelled to support themselves. It is still disgraceful for a woman to work for a money consideration. According to the code of society it is far more creditable for a woman to depend on the grudgingly bestowed bounty of relatives or friends—to be in fact a pauper in all but name—than for her to go out into the business world and win a livelihood for herself. A girl may accept costly gifts from her male acquaintances on the most flimsy pretexts and not lose caste, but if she enters a factory, store or office, the doors of society are closed against her. This applies to all the industries and to all but a few of the professions. For the great body of working women society has only snubs or at best condescending patronage. Contempt for those of the sex who work for wages is deliberately fostered. In a private school in this city the young girls when instructed in deportment are warned against walking on the west or east side avenues at six o'clock or thereabouts, and adjured never to appear on the street with ungloved hands, and all this that they may not be mistaken for working girls. Could snobbishness go farther? It is not to be wondered at that in order to escape so disgraceful (?) a fate as that of being compelled to support themselves, girls should resort to all manner of unwomanly and indelicate manœuvers to secure rich husbands. If a girl is without money, and if she may not earn it, she has no choice but to endeavor to marry it, and if the spectacle of a girl paying court with matrimonial intent to rich men is repulsive, the blame for the unwomanly exhibition should be laid at the door of society, which scorns the woman who works.

This petty and miserable ambition to be considered

among the non-producers cannot be defended. Were it to prevail Society would go to pieces, and we would be reduced to a state of savagery. It is as absurd as it would be to treat the more favored of our fellow-beings with contempt, to refuse countenance to those born of respectable parents, and to treat as inferiors the men who succeed in amassing fortunes. The English opera composer has cleverly pointed out the folly involved in such a course when he writes :

Spurn not the nobly born
With love affected,
Nor treat with virtuous scorn
The well connected.
High rank involves no shame —
We boast an equal claim
With him of humble name
To be respected !

Spare us the bitter pain
Of stern denials,
Nor with lowborn disdain
Augment our trials.
Hearts just as pure and fair
May beat in Belgrave-square
As in the lowly air
Of Seven Dials

But if this is ludicrous, so is it when reversed ; and when it is intimated that they who see the light in "Seven Dials" may not be as noble and pure as they who are born in "Belgravia," or that they who have to toil in the field may not be as deserving as they who rest in a palace. The measure of all things in this world should be personal worth — and were that the standard by which men and women were judged, and were it that which decided their social standing,

How many then should cover that stand bare !
How many be commanded that command !

Arrogance, however, is not confined to the would-be aristocrat. There are upstarts everywhere who embitter the condition of those dependent on them for work. Sometimes employers render themselves exceedingly offensive to the poor by a pretentious assumption of superiority that naturally provokes resentment. They have a certain air about them, a kind of patronizing way, an insolent condescension, which is meant to wound, and does wound, the sensibilities of the lowly. Then they are not only haughty and imperious themselves, but they frequently have overseers, foremen, or head-men of some kind, who also strut up and down shop or office, swagger and snub, browbeat and intimidate those who are placed under them. Cringing and fawning in the presence of their superiors, these sycophantic creatures are overbearing and impertinently supercilious in their absence. In reading accounts of working people presenting petitions to their employers, we have been unfavorably impressed with the manner of their reception. It has oftentimes been rough, rude, and if reasonably courteous, has generally been frigid enough to freeze out all hope from the hearts of the suppliants. In some instances, even when merely desiring a conference to determine a question of right, they have been dismissed with a curt word or two, as though presuming to think for themselves was an unpardonable offense. They are made to feel that they are only artisans, and that they should be thankful for having the opportunity to toil, without attempting to have a voice in deciding the amount of their remuneration. Lordly capital is very much disposed to treat them as serfs, or as it delights to call them, "hands," presumably because it seriously doubts whether such plainly dressed people can have "souls." But these "hands," gentlemen, are very coarse, ugly, hard things, and if you are not willing to consider their possessors entitled to attention, it may be that these "hands" will overlook the

respect due you—and we admit the amount is not enormous—and help themselves to what they regard as their own, and if opposed may clutch at and tear out your heart. Rest assured, in the long run arrogance will not pay in commercial or industrial circles. It only alienates, intensifies rivalries, and renders the solution of existing problems more doubtful and uncertain. No one is benefited by it. The employer is not, for if he is haughty with his men, his men will not hesitate to repay him by neglecting his interests; and the men are not, for if they are made to feel that they are looked down on, they will grow morose and gloomy, and will injure themselves and their families by unnecessary and unprofitable strikes. Better far the spirit of kindly concern for the industrious, and a modest bearing when dealing with them. They appreciate courtesy, and they deserve it; and moreover, the true gentleman will never fail to evince it, whether he has intercourse with rich or poor. Only insolent vulgarity determines the degree of politeness to be shown by the quality of a man's coat.

Fourthly, divisions are irrational and criminal when they result in riot and anarchy. Recent events, not only in Europe, but in the United States, and especially in Chicago, call for renewed attention to this important truth. When our government was founded, Thomas Paine represented in glowing terms the enthronement and coronation of law. Kings had been overthrown, and the era of tyranny was ended, that the reign of Constitutional freedom, order and reason might begin. This mighty revolution brought our citizens closer to the divine ideal than any previous nation had been brought. And now, however far we may have departed from it in practical affairs, law in America is publicly avowed to be the only sovereign under God to whom we owe allegiance. If that allegiance shall be thrown off, if the masses become faithless to their

monarch, it would transform our country into the likeness of the stormy Greek republic, that brilliant meteor of liberty which flashed for a moment on the night of oppression and disappeared forever. It is not, therefore, without solicitude that every patriot in this land contemplates the appearance of anarchists, nor without horror that they read their incendiary programmes, or hear of or witness their villainous deeds. Every such patriot will be moved to indignation, and will echo the sentiment of Carlyle: "All anarchy, all evil, all injustice is by the nature of it * * * suicidal, and cannot endure. Arrangement is indispensable to man; arrangement, were it grounded only on that old primary evangel of force, with scepter in the shape of hammer!" And every such loyal citizen will be brave enough to announce himself as did Luther, when he cried: "Wheresoever disorder may stand or lie, let it have a care; here is the man who has declared war with it, that will never make peace with it. Man is the missionary of order; he is the servant, not of the devil and of chaos, but of God and the universe."

When the Commune was the topic of conversation in France, and when its doings filled the columns of the French newspapers, a little child is reported to have asked its mother, "What is Communism?" Many erroneous opinions existed at that time, just as at present conflicting ideas are entertained regarding the agitators who have drawn the attention of the world to them of late by their violent speeches and their dastardly acts. We may well ask what is Anarchy? Few stop to inquire and few have any just conception of its real character. Yet if it is to be dealt with intelligently, its views and aims ought to be understood. Fundamentally it differs from the Commune. The Commune believes in merging the individual in the State; Anarchy would merge the State in the individual. The first would have everything owned and con-

trolled by the central authority, who should administer on the principle of share and share alike; the second would have no authority anywhere. It is individualism run mad. The theory of Bakounine, Herzen and the nihilistic school of Sociology is, substantially, the reformation of Society by its abrogation; a remedy as efficacious as the decapitation of a monarch to cure him of tyranny. They argue that the world is overmuch governed, and that as the people are better off where there is least government—as in America—none at all would mean perfect happiness and prosperity. Rousseau's "state of nature" underlies their reasoning and their hopes. The fallacy involved in their position may be easily illustrated. Too much food is an injury to the body, and excessive labor breaks it down; but would it not be absurd to argue that as moderation in eating and working are promotive of health, we would be stronger and better off were we to dispense with both? Steam is an important force, but for it to be available certain machinery must be constructed. At the beginning of its application the machinery was comparatively rude and cumbersome. During recent years it has been modified and simplified; but what would be thought of our sanity were we to insist that steam could be utilized without any machinery at all? In hygiene and mechanics true wisdom adapts means to the end, and does not abrogate them altogether. So in Society, its welfare and happiness depend on the exactness wherewith government is fitted to accomplish these desirable results; and, though we are not so infatuated as to allege that government in the United States is perfect, we believe that it is the most perfect instrument of its kind in existence.

The methods by which this fateful theory expects to actualize itself are in keeping with its essential principles, and are as vicious as its aims are visionary. They are directed against religion and civilization, and their battle

word is "Destruction." As the theory contemplates the overthrow of everything, the logical sequence is attempts to overthrow. A recent journal does not hesitate to advise incendiary methods, and with great precision points out how easily 500 men could destroy property and life. A writer in Ohio of good repute puts himself on record thus unmistakably and violently:

The capitalists' golden bags and the bondholders have denied us all rights. They would make us slaves. Our only hope is in earnest, organized action. Burn, kill, and destroy until we force the autocrats to terms. We have lost hope in God, hope in humanity, and hope in the world at large. Let every man do his duty. This is a time when the workingman will either become a slave or a master. Choose between the two, and choose at once. Let us give no quarter and ask none; only let us stand by each other, and each man at his post. If we must die, let us die like men and not slaves.

And Herr Most, naturally enough, opens the columns of his murderous paper to the following recommendations and threats:

Where there is no capital there are no capitalists and consequetly no rule of capital. The consideration that after such a war of destruction everything must be reproduced by the hands of laborers cannot deter from obtaining victory by universal destruction, if victory cannot be won in any other way. It is better that mankind should reproduce from the foundation all its material wealth than that it should live between mountains of wealth like beasts of burden, and should die off like dogs. With their present experience, knowledge, and natural resources the working part of mankind are able to produce ten times the amount they want. Look at the United States of America! More than nine-tenths of all the wealth existing there has been produced within a century. A single generation would now be enough to reproduce all that exists after its destruction.

We shall, therefore, confiscate where we can, and destroy where there remains no other remedy. This and nothing else is the last argument of the revolutionists.

That this "last argument" is not meaningless in the

mouth of these fanatics, witness the assassinations in Russia, the disturbances in Belgium, the dynamite outrages in England, and the bomb-throwing in Chicago. In the latter city the curious sight has more than once been presented of a company of anarchists proceeding to hold a public meeting escorted by policemen—the guardians of law countenancing those whose avowed purpose was the subversion of law. Singular, such a spectacle! It only needed the appointment by the chief of a "squad" to protect Fagin when about to train ingenuous youth in the thieves' art to complete the amazing incongruity. Probably even this favor to the scourges of Society has not been withheld by the authorities, who seem anxious for every man, however great a rascal he may be, to sit under the national "vine and fig tree with no one to molest or make him afraid." It may be said on behalf of municipal officials that they could not believe that the loud-mouthed revolutionists would ever attempt to put into execution their villainous plans. It may be so; and we have no desire to indulge in criminations. But whatever doubts may have been entertained, the fearful explosion in Haymarket square, and the subsequent disclosures of a plot to destroy Chicago, must forever have removed. That event, as cowardly as it was cruel, not only cost the lives of many brave men—honor to their memory—but made plain the fact that the threats of anarchists are not the idle vaporings of frenzied dreamers: they are rather the avowal of a deliberate purpose on the part of cool-headed and hard-hearted agitators, who intend, if possible, to raze our civilization to its foundations. There can be no mistake; and the time has come for Society to shield itself from these enemies; and it cannot do so more effectively than by insisting on the maintainance of law and order as absolutely indispensable to its prosperity and progress.

It should be borne in mind, and should be reiterated

until it becomes a popular conviction, that the sovereignty of order is closely related to the highest and truest education of humanity. Such education is not a matter of mere instruction, is not so much what we impart as what we draw out. The development of resources, particularly the unfolding of the power of self government, is its most notable achievement. To attain this there must be submission. Those schools are the best where discipline is the best. Let a child grow up in a family where there is no enforcement of parental authority, and the chances are he will lack stability and manly strength. A course of training in a college where there is no oversight will generally complete the wreck. From such homes and such institutions there generally proceeds a type of character, weak, wayward, worthless. There may be brilliant qualities, but there will be no firmness, compactness, or ability for close application. We all know the value of discipline to an army. We have recognized it in the history of campaigns; we saw it recently in the magnificent bearing of our own police. Undrilled men may evince splendid courage, but it is only organized bodies that can be used effectively. Society when duly governed, by the obedience it demands calls forth self-restraint and other soldierly qualities. It is easy to be lawless, but an effort is required to obey. Precepts, exactions, burdens make us all stronger and grander. Where they do not exist, there citizens become loose, selfish, reckless, and degenerate as rapidly as a garden where cultivation has ceased. We defy any one to give an instance of a community where the checks and balances of justice have been ignored that has not been disgraced by an inferior manhood. To rule well, men must consent to be ruled; and where they are willing to be ruled there they will become more intelligent and capable, and will render their surroundings worthier themselves. Proof of this is abundantly furnished by the history of England and of these

States, where changes of the most admirable kind have been successfully introduced, and the greatest strides toward social regeneration have been taken, in times of profound peace, and when the supremacy of law has been most cheerfully acknowledged. It is the fault of some would-be reformers that their brains have been disordered by their familiarity with the France of last century; and they have deluded themselves into the belief that revolution is in reality the only hope of the world—that the sun of the present era must set in blood if the sun of the future is to rise in unclouded serenity. As we have shown in a former paper, revolutions are dangerous experiments, which only a demagogue would encourage. And it ought to be remembered where they appear to have been warranted the people had been deprived of or had never enjoyed the ballot, and the circumstances in which they were placed were unfavorable to advantageous changes. In free countries it is different. In America, for instance, there is large liberty, and no one is forbidden to inaugurate any changes so long as he keeps within the limits of the law. If he wishes an eight-hour day the Constitution interposes no barrier; even if he desires an amendment to the fundamental law of the land that it may be made compulsory, he may obtain it if he can educate the public mind up to the provision and thus secure votes. The whole machinery of politics is at his disposal. If he can not procure it by peaceable means, he will accomplish nothing by violence. Outrages will simply alarm capital, arrest production, and deprive multitudes of the means of subsistence. Where order is respected there can be greater clearness of discernment, more deliberation in debate, and more reliance placed in the conclusions reached. Respect also for religion has its bearing upon all endeavors to improve the condition of the people everywhere. As it is grounded in the principle of obedience, and as it tends to humanize, to soften the heart, to make vivid the responsi-

bility of man for man, it prepares the way for the fair consideration of every righteous demand. It has realized all of the little brotherhood that exists in the world, has developed conscience, and has in it more promise of the future than any other agency under heaven. On this point Mr. James Russell Lowell spoke decisively at a public dinner, where some of the guests attempted to deride Christianity. He rebuked the sneers of the convivial skeptics in terms at once unsparing and unanswerable:

> The worst kind of religion is no religion at all, and these men, living in ease and luxury, indulging themselves in the amusement of going without religion, may be thankful that they live in lands where the gospel they neglect has tamed the beastliness and ferocity of the men who, but for Christianity, might long ago have eaten their carcasses like the South Sea Islanders, or cut off their heads and tanned their hides like the monsters of the French Revolution.
>
> When the microscopic search of skepticism, which has hunted the heavens and sounded the seas to disprove the existence of a Creator, has turned its attention to human society, and has found a place on this planet, ten miles square, where a decent man may live in decency, comfort, and security, supporting and educating his children unspoiled and unpolluted—a place where age is reverenced, infancy respected, manhood and womanhood honored, and human life held in due regard—when skeptics can find such a place ten miles square on this globe where the gospel has not gone and cleared the way and laid the foundations and made decency and security possible, it will then be in order for the skeptical literati to move thither and ventilate their views.

If Mr. Lowell is warranted by facts in making these statements, how insane and criminal must be all attempts to undermine the influence of religion and the authority of law. They stand together, and if the one fall the other is assuredly doomed. Unspeakably wretched would we be were they to be overborne, or were we compelled to abide where their sovereignty was continually called in question and assailed. Who would choose to live and do business in a land where perpetual threats are fulminated, and where

there is no security for property or life? Such an existence would be unendurable. A fundamental condition of happiness is a sense of safety. To be obliged to carry weapons, to be as in a beleaguered camp, to be ever watching all men as spies and traitors would be excruciating torture. Not to know when one went to sleep whether dynamite would not wreck home and family before morning would be insufferable and maddening. The citizen would be miserable, and the entire community would be panic stricken. Then disregard of law carries with it disregard of obligations. In these circumstances there could be no confidence, no trust, and no concentrated and concerted action of any kind. Suspicion would be enthroned. Idleness would follow, and crime would not be far off. Crime is anarchy, and crime is likewise suffering and sorrow. When order is preserved all of these conditions are practically reversed, and with this comes peace, contentment, mutual confidence, and material prosperity.

We must not, however, expect to succeed in maintaining the authority of law by mere arguments, or by an appeal to the common sense of the reckless crew who are breathing out threatenings and slaughter. Few among them can be convinced by sound reasoning, and they must be taught respect for government, if taught at all, by what Carlyle calls the "evangel force." A limit must be recognized in the matter of free speech; and it must come to be regarded as liable to repression when used as an instrument to stir and inflame the passions of the mob. Licentiousness in language is almost as reprehensible as licentiousness in conduct, and not infrequently leads to the latter. It is hard, at least for us, to perceive why an agitator addressing a crowd of disaffected spirits, and urging them to burn and kill should be treated leniently as though entirely harmless, while a cracksman or assassin if discovered planning with a few associates some nefarious

deed would promptly be arrested. Would such arrest be an invasion of the sacred rights of free speech? And if it would not, why should one man be permitted to counsel criminal actions, while the other is debarred from the glorious privilege? Is not the one at heart as much of a robber as the other, and is he any the less a criminal because he insists that he speaks in behalf of political reform? We do not object to either aliens or citizens airing all kinds of opinions in public, and we are willing to listen to the avowal of any heresy they may please to cherish, or to the severest criticism of our institutions. Such discussion, even when it degenerates into scurrilous twaddle, may not be without value. It is at least a safety valve, and we have no Constitutional right to prevent any inflammable individual from relieving himself of the burning thoughts that consume him. If he wishes to prove that ownership in land, or in stocks, or in money, is contrary to some imaginary law of nature, he has a perfect right to undertake the task; and if he can bring the nation to agree with him, he is at liberty to do so. But here his liberty ends. If he shall presume to go further, and shall seek to incite a small company or a large one to put his theories in practice by acts, which the statutes of the land define as crimes, he voluntarily ranks himself with other outlaws and must be dealt with as such. He is only a more pretentious kind of housebreaker, and in the interest of Society at large must be summarily suppressed. To permit him to advocate methods which subvert the rights of property, life and happiness, secured to the people by their Great Charter, would be treason, not only against morality, but against freedom as well. In these circumstances the evangel "Force" must be invoked, and the enemies of order must be restrained, even if a place has to be found for them behind the bars of a prison.

From what we have noted in this paper regarding the

unhappy and dangerous tendencies of divisions which prevail in Society, it must be evident that grave responsibilities rest upon us all; and that for the common weal we should do everything in our power to diminish existing breaches, and prevent them from becoming the avenues of innumerable evils. We should not permit ourselves to be disheartened or discouraged by them. That were a coward's folly. Let us never forget that strife has its place and its mission, and that no ill will proceed from it if it can be kept within legitimate bounds. The sea, however tempestuous, is no enemy to the land as long as its proud waves are stayed by the divinely appointed barrier. What the Rev. James Martineau has said of the spiritual world is equally true of the secular:

> Yes, these are our signs that we are on the march, and with the moving host of God's providence, and have not stepped aside and fallen asleep while the centuries sweep past. Varieties are the marks of life, the tokens of promise; it is death that knows no change.

The discussions and agitations of the hour then are not without their cheering side. They indicate that Society is awake, has fallen into no torpor, and is struggling forward toward better things. We must forever banish the expectation of uniformity, and must neither fret nor bluster because it is unattainable. Rest assured you cannot

> Tread the world
> Into a paste, and thereof make a smooth
> Uniform mound whereon to plant your flag,
> The lily-white, above the blood and brains.

What Browning further says concerning this inevitable trend in the direction of divergency may well be thoughtfully considered:

> Man is made in sympathy with man
> At outset of existence, so to speak;
> But in dissociation, more and more,
> Man from his fellows, as their lives advance

In culture: still humanity, that's born
A mass, keeps flying off, pining away
Even into a multitude of points,
And ends in isolation, each from each.

There are scientists who in similar terms describe the origin of the planetary system. From one molten central mass they claim that gleaming orbs proceeded, being thrown off in the maddening whirl of the parent sun. According to their theory, the entire universe has tended from unity to multiformity, from simplicity to complexity; and, admitting what they defend so eloquently, is it not manifest that this irruption and disturbance has ended in sublimer and more beneficent order and harmony than prevailed during the monotonous reign of primal chaos? Is there not in this wonderful formation of diverse worlds, and in this sweet concord and coöperation of them all, a lesson for those who grow wearied and distressed with the ceaseless divisions which appear on every side in village, town and city? These too are unavoidable, and these likewise, if not abused, must work together for the general good. Instead of denouncing them and cursing them, we should rather seek to understand them, and should do our utmost to render them tributary to social development and happiness. If this is to be done, it is imperative that a candid and conciliatory spirit be cultivated. It should never be forgotten that there is always something commendable and just at the heart of doctrines and systems, which, taken as a whole, are most cruel and pernicious. There is no error all error, no evil all evil, and even no truth all truth. Shades, gradations, and degrees are inseparable from everything of man's devising, and the absolutely perfect comes neither from his brain nor hand.

Socialism itself is not without some redeeming features. Its plea for more brotherhood in human relations, its asser-

tion of equality, its demand for a fairer share of the blessings of earth, and its protest against the squalid animalism to which multitudes are doomed, are not without reason, and they have not been without effect. The endeavors of its advocates have roused the attention of serious and kindly people to the deplorable condition of the toiling poor, have led to measures of relief and to thoughtful discussions of the remedies best fitted to heal the gaping wounds of our times. In our condemnation of their foolish and mischievous recommendations, let us not be blind to what is sound and wholesome, and let us not overlook the services which they have performed. Everyone should keep his eyes open to "the soul of good in evil things," and if he does, he will often see some evil even in the soul of good. The more familiar he becomes with the opinions of others, and the more he probes the merits of his own, he will, unless he is hopelessly obtuse or bigoted, incline toward modesty, forbearance and charity. This generous and benignant temper cannot fail to promote a better understanding between rivals and factions, and must conduce to a rational settlement of many open and bitter ruptures which now disgrace community.

But in addition to the spirit of candor, if we are to escape from present perils we must foster on the part of the intelligent and well-to-do classes a more direct and personal interest in the welfare of the ignorant and unfortunate. Mr. Jay Gould is reported to have expressed a willingness to exchange half his fortune for the power of an eminent actor to sway and influence an audience. Such a sacrifice is not necessary. With far less money than that, were he so minded, he could rouse the enthusiastic praise of a nation, and produce more lasting effects than all the players on the stage. He could inaugurate a system by which the thousands of persons employed in the service of the various companies he represents would be better cared for than

they are now; and thus he could, with just a little consideration, and a very moderate pecuniary loss, become one of the most princely benefactors of his country. Let him also apply himself, unbiased by selfishness, to the labor problems of the hour; let him study them, not merely from the standpoint of the capitalist, but from that of the patriot, and he who has been able to acquire the enormous wealth he possesses would doubtless succeed beyond most men in presenting a feasible solution. There are also others in business who are competent to throw light on these questions who are quite absorbed in mercenary schemes of self-aggrandizement, and who scarcely bestow a thought on their less prosperous neighbors. Carlyle describes them as those who "have made money by dealing in cotton, dealing in bacon, jobbing scrip, digging metal in California," and who "have become glittering man-mountains filled with gold and preciosities," "revered by the surrounding flunkies." Unhappily we have many such characters in this "nineteenth century of illumination." Not long since, when passing the house of a millionaire noted for his penuriousness and lack of public spirit, a friend said to us: "He ought to die, and a score of others like him in Chicago, for they are not doing anything for art, culture or religion, and were they only decently buried, their estates in new hands might be administered more usefully." This was a hard saying, and yet justifiable in view of all the facts. Commercial chieftains and captains of industry cannot be excused from the obligations which attach to their positions of influence. They are the natural leaders of the children of toil, and they cannot be indifferent to their welfare without incurring guilt. If they cannot do anything else, they can imitate Sir John Sinclair, of Scotland, who applied himself to the development of trade, that his fellow-countrymen might be enriched; or they can copy the course pursued

by Mr. Tangye, of England, whose care of his workmen, some two thousand in number, and whose concern for their advancement in intelligence and domestic comfort has rendered strikes next to impossible, and has endeared him to all who serve him ; or they can tread in the footsteps of the proprietors of the Pillsbury flouring mill at Minneapolis, who have distributed to their men from year to year large sums in addition to their wages as their share in the profits of the business ; or, at least, they can follow the example of Robert L. Stuart, of New York, and that of his brother Alexander, who donated upwards of $2,000,000 to hospitals, schools and churches, and equally with them, the generous philanthropy of William E. Dodge, who has left behind him, not only an honorable name, but a noble heritage for the lasting benefit of mankind. These wise things our great merchants and manufacturers can do, and even these would go far to prevent the divisions of Society from degenerating into fierce feuds and disastrous disruptions.

Editors, reporters, clergymen, book-writers, and the entire guild whose privilege it is to shape and guide public opinion, should encourage our money-kings in such works as we have described; and they should be also faithful to instruct the people at large in sound principles of political economy. They will not do much to avert the storm if they are partisans, especially if they appear to be mere apologists and defenders of the affluent. We confess to a large measure of disappointment at the tone of current articles and volumes on the labor question. Not a few of them seem disposed to blame the working classes exclusively for existing misunderstandings, and have little else to say than to advise submission to their lot. One writer tells them that there is not enough money in the civilized portions of the globe to warrant better wages being paid, though Gladstone, after a careful computation, has clearly

shown that they do not secure anything like a fair proportion of the wonderful increase of wealth which has distinguished our times. Another has informed them that they can subsist comfortably on $200 a year, though it is questionable whether the gentleman himself would like to undertake the experiment. And still another has written on the "Wages of Capital," and has claimed because three or four per cent interest bearing bonds were eagerly sought that that rate indicates what the ordinary earnings of capital are. He knows or ought to know that this is an error. Mr. Vanderbilt, Mr. Gould, and others similarly successful, never accumulated their millions through three per cent investments of any kind. The fact that large sums can be borrowed by the government for so meager a compensation simply indicates that some men have on hand more cash than they know what to do with, which would not be the case had not capital earned out of all proportion to labor; and is no criterion of the actual remuneration expected and received when capital is applied to the various industries. Moreover, is it not strange, if the wages of capital are as low as some persons try to make out, and if those of labor are relatively far higher, that the representatives of the former should be able to build palatial residences, drive expensive horses, sail luxurious yachts, and maintain mansions by the sea shore, while the representatives of the latter frequently find it difficult to keep soul and body together? When the enjoyments of life are so one-sided, is it not natural to conclude that its rewards are so also, and on the same side? Such statements as we have hastily glanced at are altogether too partial and too biased for them to pass unchallenged. They mislead those who have not time to investigate for themselves, and they are so faulty as to fail entirely in satisfying the discontented for whom they are evidently designed. Though they may be fathered by clergymen, or adopted by editors who swear

that they love the dear people, they are so supereminently partisan that they fly wide of their mark. If these leaders of opinion are really to do anything to abate the bitterness of controversy, and if they are to compose disputes, take the virus out of warring tongues, and unify rather than further divide communities, they must learn to be more just and considerate. We do not say that they must be blind to the blunders and vices of the poor, or that they must misrepresent and denounce the rich. Far from it. Let them deal fairly by both, show each his errors, and attempt to lay down principles of action that will in their working prove advantageous to all.

Neither let them, nor any others who desire social advancement, wax impatient, because the work they have at heart makes not more rapid progress. We must all learn to make haste slowly. Bewildering millions of years, scientists asssure us, were needed to develop our globe, to subdue its conflicting and destructive forces, and to adjust and balance its warring elements before it was a suitable dwelling place for man. That the Almighty fashioned and furnished it at a stroke, effected everything by one creative fiat, is now generally discredited. Is it not then reasonable to believe that Society, however active the agencies may be which are engaged on its construction, must also demand many centuries before its divisions can be healed, or can be so modified, restrained, and governed as to render them innoxious? England claims that her Constitution is a growth, the result of various and instructive experiences; and in a sense this holds good of Society. While men are planning, devising, experimenting, only that survives which has been sifted out of heaps of rubbish, and which has been subjected to the refining and testing fires of trial. This law no human art or skill can evade or suspend. It is as operative now as in the past, and will prevail in the future. The expectation entertained in

some enthusiastic circles that a wonderful *coup d' etat* will happily end all controversies and bring in an era of universal harmony, is delusive: as delusive as that other *coup d' etat* which elevated Napoleon III., but which did not regenerate France, and which ended in the humiliation of Sedan. There is no royal and easy road to the Millenium, but only a rugged path, with many turnings and many pitfalls. The men who are impatient, who would destroy as the surest means of saving, who would kill as the only method of preserving alive, and who would dash over the cataract rather than go round by the canal are not reliable guides. It never seems to occur to them that frequently "the longest way round is the shortest road home." Like Alexander they would cut the Gordian knot, never perceiving that following the conquest of Asia comes the fatal excesses of Babylon.

"'Tis the time's plague when madmen lead the blind."

And this plague appears to have smitten the age with terrible virulence, and cranks of every type have become the oracles of unlettered thousands. Deplorable as their madness is in many respects, never is it more pernicious than when it scorns all precedents, and attempts to accomplish in a moment changes that can only be wisely and permanently effected deliberately and with the intelligent concurrence of the people. Patience then is indispensable. Waiting must supplement hoping. The tedious and fatiguing work of investigation, arguing, and reforming must go on, and the end all lovers of their kind have in view be brought about by judicious, though not corrupt, indirectness and concession, and possibly by sagacious compromises. Weariness will often be felt; but then the goal, far off, yet ever coming nearer, should strengthen and encourage. And all who falter by the way, or who may be tempted to hazard

everything on a doubtful experiment, may well take to themselves the counsel addressed by Tennyson to Gladstone:

> Statesman, be not precipitate in thine act
> Of steering; for the river here, my friend,
> Parts in two channels moving to one end:
> This goes straightforward to the cataract;
> That, streams about the bend;
> But tho' the cataract seems the nearer way—
> Whate'er the crowd on either bank may say,
> Take thou the "bend," t'will save thee many a day.

VIII.

THE AMUSEMENTS OF SOCIETY.

No more for me of "people's privilege;"
No witnessing "the grand old comedy,"
Coëval with our freedom: * * * * *

Such outrage done the public—Phædra named!
Such purpose to corrupt ingenuous youth!
Such insult cast on female character!—
Why, when I saw that bestiality—
So beyond all brute-beast imagining,
That when, to point the moral at the close,
Poor Salabaccho, just to show how fair
Was "Reconciliation," stripped her charms,
That exhibition simply bade us breathe,
Seemed something healthy and commendable;
After obscenity grotesqued so much
It slunk away revolted at itself.
Henceforth I had my answer when our sage
Pattern-proposing seniors pleaded grave,
"You fail to fathom here the deep design!
All's acted in the interest of truth,
Religion, and those manners old and dear
Which made our city great."

—*Robert Browning.*

AMUSEMENT, as generally conducted and pursued in these days, is a very serious affair. Play is frequently only another name for work, and diversion is merely an additional form of weariness. Business is hardly more exacting and exhausting than pleasure, and to comply with the demands of both usually taxes to the utmost even an iron constitution. The item of cost is not the least grave of the many questions to be considered by

those who are in the habit of giving or attending entertainments. They are generally very expensive. An immense sum of money is devoted to them annually, and far more than they are worth, and far more than any nation can afford to squander in such a way. When a man in moderate circumstances invites a few friends to spend a social evening with him, he often feels bound to provide a feast beyond his means, and to pay for which must embarrass him through several months. What then must be the drain on the pecuniary resources of those persons who breathe, or rather pant, in the atmosphere of the gay world? Attendance on balls calls for an extraordinary outlay on dress, equipage and flowers, and the same is true of the opera; and it is not uncommon for more to be wasted on such occasions than the reveler contributes to charity in a year. As to the race-course, it generally leads to bankruptcy; and this is not to be wondered at when a jockey, like Archer, has earned as much as forty-three thousand dollars in a single year. Opera-signers are proverbially high-priced, and their remuneration is something to bewilder honest plodders in productive industries. Thousands upon thousands have to be lavished on nightingale-like warblers, and other thousands on the stage and its furniture in rendering the compositions of the great masters. Wagner has given us "the music of the future;" but in one respect it is like that of the past—it is exceedingly costly. Theatres, also, are high-priced luxuries. A dramatist by the name of Simms received in a few months one hundred and sixty thousand dollars for a play entitled "In the Ranks," a play which a newspaper describes as "a rank piece of stuff." A portion of these enormous profits, surpassing the sums paid Tennyson or Carlyle for genuine literary work, is drawn from the meager earnings of the poorer classes. Artisans, clerks, petty tradesmen, day-laborers, commercial travelers, seamen, soldiers, and multitudes of

others whose salaries are small, are found among the patrons of stage and concert-hall, and without whose ill-advised extravagance they would be materially reduced in number. This prodigality is not justifiable. Are we not "paying too dear for our whistle," even though it may be a melodious one? Retrenchment is absolutely a duty. Should not frugality be cultivated even in our pleasures?

But aside from the matter of expense, the most popular of modern amusements, as they are managed at present, are far too exciting for the good of their supporters. They do not tend to quiet, calm, and relaxation. Instead of this, many of them unduly strain the nervous system, stimulate excessively the brain, and intensify into dangerous rapidity the action of the heart. They rouse to the highest pitch the feelings, plunge the mind into a maddening whirl, and often leave their victim a prey to bewildering emotions. A blood-and-thunder play, filled with startling incidents, and overflowing with grandiloquent sentiments, is like a fiery intoxicant which inflames and frenzies. Audiences are ravished, transported out of themselves, are shocked, electrified, and overwhelmed by gorgeous scenery, dazzling dresses, and especially by the vicissitudes of lovers, the machinations of villains, and the soul-harrowing deeds of tyrants which make up the prominent features of the ever-popular melodrama. The ballet doubtless affects the spectator somewhat differently; but the passion, the pruriency, the lasciviency which it ordinarily invokes throws him into a state of feverish delerium or of debilitating agitation. Dances at balls and parties may at times produce deleterious results, not of course always or necessarily, but possibly, particularly when carried to excess. Late hours, wine-bibbing, crowded rooms, glaring light, and scanty costumes, that disclose what they presumably mean to hide, all tend to a high degree of animation, not to say anything of a proba-

ble flushed and over-wrought condition of mind and body. We need to realize that this unnatural excitement, and the consequent drain on our vitality, unfit us for the practical duties of life. From what has entranced us on the stage how difficult to turn again to commonplace and monotonous toil. With the fever of passion scarcely allayed how hard to apply ourselves once more to the uninteresting and fatiguing. When the fair forms of giddy partners of the dance disappear from our side in the gray of the morning, their shadows will still attend us to the dreary office and the begrimed workshop, and the haunting memory of their fairy beauty will add to the uncouthness and unsightliness of everything about us. Such experiences were they merely occasional, possibly might not be detrimental to our real welfare; but when they are continually repeated they tend to dissatisfy us with our avocations and to disqualify us for their exacting demands. Then, in thinking on this subject, the remarkable lack of self-control on the part of most pleasure-seekers ought to be taken into account. Moderation is not a virtue they usually cultivate. If any particular diversion becomes fashionable, they dash into it with all the recklessness of barbarians, and never seem to know when to stop. If some kind of dance is the rage, they perpetually whirl in it from evening to evening and from house to house. Should "Progressive Euchre" occupy the attention of "Upper tendom" for a season, they speedily convert it into "excessive" euchre, and the talk of drawing rooms is tainted and infected with idioms familiar to the gambling fraternity. If the roller skating rink comes into favorable notice, straightway it is made a dangerous nuisance by those who appear incapable of understanding that even a thing good in its way may be abused, and may be pushed too far. In a word, on every side we have evidences of impetuosity and intemperateness, and the natural reaction is expressed

by the terms nervousness and prostration. What is supposed to be sought for the sake of relaxation and recuperation, in reality enervates, and ultimately depresses instead of cheering. This fearful perversion of that, which can only be justified on the ground of the refreshment and invigoration it yields, is inexcusable; and it is to be sincerely hoped that as religion and education extend their beneficent sway sanctified common-sense will not merely eliminate from it every vicious element, but will pursue it with wise discrimination and self-restraint.

Let it not be concluded from what we have written, that we are disaffected toward amusements. We only oppose such as are injurious, and the hot and feverish chase of such as are in themselves harmless. Recreation is a necessity of our being. We need to bend, relax and be merry. There is no sin in cheerfulness, and no iniquity in play. We are not conscious of any morbid strictness on this subject; but we are fully convinced that the perils connected with popular diversions make their selection an affair of some seriousness. Yet while we pen this, we do not desire to be classed with those persons who insist that it is the duty of the Church to supply them, and to guard what she furnishes from abuse. Such a work as this lies entirely outside of her mission. It is doubtless her duty to teach moderation, and to warn against the evil side of worldly pleasures; but she is under no obligation to convert herself into a purveyor of even innocent folly. Her vocation is far different, and far higher. Let her adhere to it. There is something humiliating in her endeavors at times to enter into rivalry with showmen and mountebanks. Tableaux, dramatic dialogues, spectacular Christmas festivals, conducted in courts dedicated to prayer and religious instruction, are not edifying spectacles. We do not say they are sinful; but we do claim that they are out of place, and that they tend to impair the feeling of reverence

which the house of God should awaken. The plea that they are required to enable Christianity to maintain its hold on the young, is weak and indefensible. Not much of a compliment is there in it to a Faith which constantly affirms the divinity of its origin and the stability of its power. It insinuates that the influence of this faith depends in no small degree on trivialities external to itself, and to the interests of which it was never consecrated by its Founder. We are fearful if its grip on the rising generation is due to such causes, it can have but a very feeble grasp on the moral and spiritual life. Nor is it creditable to the friends of religion when they have recourse to theatricals, more or less disguised, and to fairs and lottery schemes to meet the pecuniary liabilities they have assumed in the name of the Lord. The fact that they are able to provide such entertainments and make purchases at them, precludes the supposition that they are too poor to meet their money obligations. Why, then, not discharge them without employing means as questionable in character as they are in reality superfluous? To outsiders it must seem as though Christ's disciples looked for some equivalent in kind, some sort of compensation in return for what they give, as though they were mercenary and calculating, and as though they doubted the certainty of recompense in the world to come. Well, "they have their reward." They get what they bargained for—the gewgaws, and the ice cream—and they miss the approving word of the Blessed Master. Let them not imagine that they will receive both. They must choose between them; for it is not likely that the Lord will confer on them a spiritual blessing in exchange for money which has been applied to his cause in the spirit of trade, and which has degraded it in the eyes of the world. But even were these efforts legitimate, and were they sufficient to meet the craving for amusement as it is felt in some quarters, they

will utterly fail in the majority of cases. There are multitudes of people who do not enjoy the coarse comicalities of funny preachers, who are not refreshed by uproarious farces enacted in prayer-meeting rooms, who are not entranced and invigorated by Sunday school children dressed *a la ballet* in gauzy costumes, with spangled wings and flesh-colored tights, presumably to represent immature angels; and neither are they pleased nor diverted by the slang and cheap jests of improvised Kris Kringles, making their appearance magically down scenic chimneys constructed in the chapel, amid all the gorgeous radiance of blue and red fire. If they are to have such things at all they prefer them where they properly belong, in the circus and theater; and they humbly think, if these tents and buildings and what goes on in them are justly condemned, the Church is in very poor business when she cultivates in the young a taste for their performances. They do not declare, any more than we do, that these forms of amusement are necessarily wicked, but only that the temple of God is no place for them, and that in the present condition of the Stage, the Church had better give no direct or indirect sanction to its claims.

If tableaux, amateur theatricals, and other entertainments of a harmless nature are indispensable to recreation, let them be given at home or under the auspices of private circles, and not in connection with religious edifices, or religious services. The home is, after all, the true center of everything that is good and wholesome, amusements included, and should ever be made attractive and restful. Parents should be careful that they drive not their children by undue severity from the domestic hearth. The ascetic life is not always favorable to pity or morality. What is denied in the family is often sought in the world and frequently ends in dissipation and corruption. We believe that a joyous household, where games and plays

of various kinds are generally encouraged, is a bulwark against vice. But when laughter is condemned, when chess, checkers, and an occasional dance are regarded as among the works of the devil, it would seem as though the young were thrust out, by those who should care for them most tenderly, to brave dangerously seductive temptations. God help them when this is the case. While we advocate, and for the reason assigned, making the family bright with diversions, we also believe there is need of circumspection on the part of fathers and mothers. They should avoid the approval of what may lead to bad habits, such as wine-drinking and card-playing. Most of them will admit the propriety of the first recommendation, but we apprehend that many of them will dispute the second. What harm can there be, they will ask, in a friendly game of whist, or even of poker? Perhaps the question cannot be answered satisfactorily. We admit that we are biased as to the merit of card-playing: we dislike it, and see no good whatever in it. Had we our way we would abolish it altogether, and blot out the memory of it from mankind. In our mind it is always associated with gambling, with low dives, with idlers, loafers and opium-smoking celestial laundrymen, and with deeds of darkness. Cards are thoroughly disreputable. They have no character, so to speak, and to us seem about as decent as a set of burglars' tools; and we would as soon think of offering the latter as a means of entertainment to guests as the former. To this the reply may be made that the comparison is merely the result of prejudice. Possibly; and yet are they not both the rogue's implements, and are they not both intimately allied with crime? Not a few black-legs declare that they acquired the skill and the taste which have vitiated their career in respectable and even christian homes. They there learned to play, and then their cupidity was excited by the small sums that were hazarded. From this

early school they went forth a curse to themselves and to others. It is no sufficient answer to say that they might have learned elsewhere, and doubtless would. Yet there is a doubt; and what we plead for is that the guardians of youth should not convert this doubt into a certainty; and that they should not help to fasten on their offspring a pernicious habit.

But, let this pass. We are glad when we hear of home amusements, as we are of wholesome out-door recreations. Base ball and lawn tennis, when not degraded to gambling games, are invigorating and healthful. They can do no one any harm; yet, let us be honest, they do very little good when they are played by professionals. Spectators are not strengthened; and in sport, whatever may be true of theology, they are not benefited vicariously. Fishing and hunting may be enjoyed without thought of evil, and other pleasures which nature yields may be tasted with a consciousness of innocence. Would that we had more of them, and would that we sought less in the artificial and more in the real the recuperation that we need! Especially, would that the public regarded the race-course with suspicion, and appreciated more than it does its unadulterated perniciousness. Thomas Hughes, writing to a friend, deplores the naturalization of this British institution in America. He declares that it is altogether corrupt and mischievous, and we agree with him. No greater curse, except that of strong drink, can be fostered by any country. It begets gambling in its worst forms, and leads to almost every kind of crime. We contend that it is entirely an abuse without a single redeeming quality. Looked at from all sides, it presents the one aspect of deformity. Some of its friends have entered the extenuating plea, that it has improved the breed of horses. Supposing this to be the case, still it cannot be doubted that the turf has wrought a marked deterioration in the breed of men.

Humanity has been injured more than horse-flesh has been benefited. The effect on the stable has been slight, so slight that England has ceased to look for army horses in the domain of the jockey; and the influence on the home has been thoroughly demoralizing. The gain in horse-flesh is imperceptible, but the loss in manhood is incalculable. This is what ought to be considered; for even were it true that the race-course could convert every spavined, glandered, broken-winded Rozinante in the land into a full-winged fiery Pegasus, the corruption and debasement of a single soul would be too dear a price to pay for the startling transformation. We believe as much as any one in fast horses; we love to drive them, and we do not think it a mortal sin to speed them. There is no particular virtue in going slow, and no culpability in going rapidly. Were a regular race but a mere exhibition of staying and moving qualities, and were it separated from betting and kindred evils, we would have no objection to offer. But we know it is not this. The horses are simply the conveniences adopted by men of loose morals for the perpetration of huge frauds on the confiding. Their improvement is not the foremost thought of the professional "sport," but rather, with their help, the ruin of extravagant profligates. The trainer does not care for the horse, the jockey does not, the owner does not, neither does the public; but all are interested in the *money* they may earn, or win through its prowess. That's all there is to it. In fact, there is really very little that looks like amusement in a horse-race. It does not rest, recuperate and refresh; but rather, excites and exhausts. To all intents and purposes it is a business, and a business, like the liquor traffic, fatal in its entire bearing on all who have anything to do with it, and like that traffic it ought to be voted out of the country as a nuisance and a curse. This is the only reform to which it is susceptible, and the quicker it is

effected the better for all parties concerned, including the horse.

Modern dancing, while open to several serious objections, is far from deserving to rank with the unmitigated evil we have just condemned. Naturally enough it has many admirers, especially among the young. We repeat "naturally;" for the "poetry of motion" is as fascinating to the eye as the poetry of sound is to the ear. Shakespeare's Florizel says to Perdita, "When you do dance I wish you a wave of the sea," and there is something suggestive of the undulatory movement of the billows in quadrille and waltz. As there is a certain rhythm in the beat and splash of the ocean, so also is there a beauty of emphasis and cadence in the measured step and swaying form of those whose graceful actions seem to flow from the music which accompanies them. The ancients looked with a more favorable eye on this type of pleasure, as it was indulged in among them, than many of the graver sort of people do in our day. They regarded it as enjoying the protection and patronage of one of the muses. If Erato smiled on lyric poetry, Calliope on heroic verse and Euterpe on music, Terpsichore distinguished dancing with her special approval and support. Being thus honored by the daughter of Mnemosyne and Jupiter, it was not surprising that it should have been introduced into some forms of worship, as in that of Bacchus and Cybele, or that it should have found recognition in the mystic philosophy of Pythagoras. But not only among the Greeks do we find it at times dedicated to sacred uses; among the Latins also, particularly under the direction of the Salii, was it repeatedly devoted to the glory of the gods. Even the Hebrews were not strangers to its joyous steps in seasons of devout gratitude and of solemn thanksgiving. David called upon the people to praise God's name in the dance, and himself danced before the Lord when the Ark was restored. True,

as we may be reminded, Saul's daughter, Michal, reproved David for his conduct; but, as anyone may see for himself who reads the narrative, her criticism was not sustained by Jehovah. Some of the Christian fathers were blind to anything like inherent immorality in the dance, and hence they represented the angels, and "the glorious company of the apostles" as engaging in it; and Scaliger gravely informs the world that some of the early bishops themselves led in its mazes on feast days. A change, however, seems to have come over the views of many religious people with the rise of the modern ballet; and as it progressed, and as it infected this amusement with artificiality and with voluptuous grace, they began to question whether, after all, it was not a deadly curse, a devilish spirit disguised "as an angel of light" to lure multitudes to ruin. This suspicion became a settled conviction in some quarters, and in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was deemed highly improper and inconsistent for a dissenting Christian to take part even in a minuet, to say nothing of the more soul-destroying waltz. Members were excluded from the church if they went to a ball; and as to a dancing master, alas! poor wretch, he had no social recognition here, and no hope of immortal felicity hereafter. Such was the prevailing feeling in evangelical circles with the dawning of the present century, and a few individuals still adhere to the old-time puritanical notions on this subject. But not only the age, the church as well, for good or for bad, has largely outgrown them. The dance has not been restored to the position it occupied in Greece, and never will; nor has it revived sufficiently in public favor to warrant a Christian bishop leading off in a lively and worldly polka, and never can; but it is looked on with more leniency and toleration, and its indulgence under judicious restraints is no longer prohibited on pain of excommunication, except, perhaps, in some solitary cases where discrim-

ination and common sense are overborne by bigotry and fatuity. Many pious persons who are not "bigoted," and who do not believe in ecclesiastical censures, do not encourage dancing, fearing its influence on spiritual life to be deleterious; and yet they have so far departed from the rigid ideas of their ascetic sires as to admit explicitly that it is not wicked in itself.

We shall not undertake the uncalled-for task of defending the present attitude of religious thought on this subject. It is hardly necessary. There can be no moral obliquity in any particular form of motion, whether a walk, gallop, hop, reel or jig. We may assuredly "go-as-we-please" without incurring guilt, unless, indeed, we go in such a way as to excite lascivious longings in ourselves or others. This, it is claimed, is the case with some kinds of dances. If it is, then they ought to be discarded without ostracizing others which do not.

We can readily understand how on the ground assigned, the ballet posturers and acrobats ought to be rebuked, and as far as practicable suppressed. The indelicacy and even scandalous indecency of some of their exhibitions ought to awaken such marked disapproval as to render their repetition impossible; but while we are clear as to their character we have never been able to see, except in extraordinary cases, the same evidences of depravity in the social dances of which we have spoken. We must admit that we have been much more shocked at the low cut, very low cut, dresses of our ladies, and among them, too, the purest and the best, than we have ever been at anything we have ever witnessed in the way of poetic motions in parlor or ball-room. What is exceedingly suggestive, these displays are, as a rule, only made by those whose charms are conspicuous. Rarely will a narrow-chested, scraggy, yellow-necked female bare herself to the mocking eyes of those around her. Then this fashion *is* for somebody's eyes! Whose?

Let us hope that our ladies do not pause to ask when they are seeing how much of naked beauty they can expose without being positively indecorous, unless we conclude that the fashion is altogether indecorous and immodest. Yet, perhaps it might be better if they did ask when preparing to clothe themselves so sparingly. Charity leads us to suppose that they are not conscious of any indelicacy in their scanty costume; and that same charity ought to judge leniently those dances which have far less actual impropriety about them than there is in this hint of Edenic nudeness. We are not specially pleading for their continuance. If they are debilitating, emasculating and corrupting in their tendency, let them be reformed or be banished from polite circles; but what we contend for is, that these instances ought not to prejudice us against all dancing in whatever circumstances it may be enjoyed. As an amusement, if pursued with moderation, it is invigorating and restful, and banishes care more speedily than almost any other diversion. It is peculiarly becoming in children and in youth, and it is particularly attractive when it is engaged in without formality. What is more harmless and more indicative of happiness than a group of young people, beneath the parental roof, on the spur of the moment clearing the room, and then dashing forward with many a laugh in the mazes and intricacies of reel or cotillion? Were there more of such scenes there would doubtless be less morbidness and melancholy than there are now, and our boys and girls would not so soon be prematurely old.

Let us see what the associations and accessories are which render this amusement injurious and perilous. Perhaps we can classify them with sufficient accuracy under the heads, "Place," "Time," "Degree." Regarding "place," there is none more desirable in every way than the family; and none more objectionable than those cheap music-halls where

late hours and promiscuous company often lead to vices of the worst type. They are vestibules to intemperance and to other immoralities. The atmosphere poisoned with the malodorous breath of a panting multitude, the glare of lights, the exciting strains of music, the undue familiarity between the sexes, promoted by the absence of restraints. and the very exhilaration caused by whirling and rapid motions, tend to madden, and break down the reserve of virtue. Such resorts as these are the corrupters of youth, and they should share the fate of the saloon. A community with positive moral convictions would not tolerate their existence ; and the fact that they are found in almost every town and city is only another proof of the laxity which prevails. Nor can much more be said in favor of fashionable balls. Their surroundings may be more brilliant, the guests more elegant, the music more classical, the refreshments more delicate; but after all there is "much of a muchness" in their influence on the heart ; and their worth is not greatly in advance of the flashy halls, with their discordant fiddlers, stale beer, and Brummagen gentility. In the former as well as the latter there is the subtle appeal to passions that had better never be roused, and the display of rivalries, jealousies and ambitions that had better never be fostered. Moreover, the ball is rarely, if ever, for amusement. It is a ceremonious occasion, a formal affair for intrigues, for the marketing of daughters, for the vulgar parade of affluence, and for almost everything else, except diversion. There is hardly anything in it of a restful and refreshing character, and there is much that is wearisome and disgusting. Such places should be avoided. Dancing in either case can only be fatiguing and injurious, and can never compensate for the risk assumed. Let us never forget that it is simply a privilege, not a duty. We are under no everlasting obligation to hop, jump, skip and whirl to sound of music, but

we are to preserve our characters spotless; and if the interest of the latter demand in some circumstances abstinence from the former, we have no right to hesitate as to our choice.

Late hours also vitiate this amusement. People leave their homes at 11 o'clock at night for a ball-room, and return early the next morning, and yet call such excesses pleasure. Weary, languid, and cross they resume their daily avocations, and then wonder that they are not successful in business. We understand how exercise in the early evening can really recuperate, and contributing to quiet slumber, serve the true end of diversion. But this going out when one ought to be going to bed, this forcing one's eyes open when they ought to be shut, and this arraying one's self in "purple and fine linen" when one ought to be asleep, is the height of unnaturalness, and in any other creature than man would be regarded as absurdity bordering on insanity. But in addition to the "time," the "degree" of one's devotion to the dance has much to do with its harmlessness or harmfulness. With some persons it is the supreme end of existence. They think of but little else. The mysteries of *jeté, chassé, coupé, bourrée, gaillarde, contre-temps, pirouette,* and the rest, absorb them quite, and all other mundane concerns are neglected. Even their dreams are full of hornpipes, reels, sarabands, rigadoons, and what not, and their waking hours are crowded with visions of dazzling throngs trippingly moving on "the light fantastic toe." Young ladies of this turn of mind waste entire days planning for coming "events of the season," and more in talking over their memories, and then in repeating the doleful process. Some not over-well balanced youths vie with them in this nerveless mode of living; and thus we come to be afflicted with a "species," which is a decided "variation" from what we have been taught to regard as "the manly" or "womanly." To

such people the universe is a ball-room, the moral law a code of harmonious gyrations, the Supreme Himself a gigantic kind of dancing-master, and the end a chilly morning dawning over sleepy revelers, a broken fiddle, and a somnolent eternity. Sad, unspeakably sad, this possibility of a healthful enjoyment becoming an unwholesome infatuation, and of a human life being frittered away on the infinitely frivolous and unimportant.

The Theatre, as an institution of Society, furnishing a varied and entrancing kind of entertainment, is open to serious criticism. We are not of those who hate the Stage, or who ask with bitter sneer: "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" and yet we are compelled to confess, that the poet was not without justification when he penned the scathing words:

> The theatre was from the very first,
> The favorite haunt of Sin, though honest men—
> Some very honest, wise, and worthy men—
> Maintained it might be turned to good account;
> And so perhaps it might, but never was.
> From first to last, it was an evil place,
> And now such things are acted there as make
> The devils blush, and from the neighborhood
> Angels and holy men tremblingly retire?

In replying to such assaults as this, it is usual for the friends of the theatre to assert that it is so far from being a source of unmixed evil, that it is in a very valid sense "a school of virtue." This position we have always regarded as untenable and though we are inclined to take the most charitable view, we cannot permit such an assumption to go unchallenged. The theatre may be many other things, a school of oratory, of art, of grace, of almost anything else under heaven, but not of virtue. In proof of what we affirm, there is no manager who would be willing to announce that his plays were all in the interest of morality, and that he hoped his audience would

come and be made better. To the contrary, most of them by insinuations, suggestive titles, and posters bordering on nastiness, intimate to the public that they mean to steer as far away from purity as the law will allow. They know that their patrons do not seek instruction, but amusement; not ethical culture but diversion; that they are not looking for school or prayer-meeting, but the very opposite; and that nothing would keep them away more effectually than the impression that they would be compelled to endure the discipline of the one or the exhortations of the other. Moreover, is it not true, that, up to the present, all endeavors to reform the Stage have practically failed? We do not say that future efforts must inevitably come to nothing; or that Mr. Henry Irving, and perhaps Mr. Lawrence Barrett, may not succeed in doing something in this direction. In other words we are not hopeless. But the fact that attempts thus far have not been sustained, and that improvements have rapidly given way almost as soon as accomplished, is a sad comment on the "school-of-virtue" theory. Strange it is that writers, such as Otto Peltzer, in *Music and Drama*, or the authors of the "Symposium" in the *North American Review*, (December, 1883,) should have always in view the drama as it might be, and as it ought to be, but not as it is. They and others deplore its present condition, complain in their own elegant phraseology of the "rot" which has overtaken it, and of the decay of what old professionals designate as the "legitimate." Does it not seem singular that a school of virtue should constantly provoke such lamentations; and that it should draw saloons and bagnios into its immediate neighborhood, and often tolerate a public bar within its walls; and should ever be the one favorite resort of pimps, blacklegs, topers, sneak-thieves and loafers? Are *they* seeking virtue? Is it their relish for goodness that draws them in crowds to pit and gallery?

Possibly; but we would never suspect it. A recent author has praised Racine and Corneille, has represented Moliere at the moral guide of France, and has extolled the lofty sentiments of Shakespeare, Goethe, and Schiller; and in addition he has attempted to show the reforming power of such plays as theirs on the public. All this is very well. We do not doubt that some stage performances have ridiculed or even denounced social follies and vices, and that they are frequently adorned with ennobling thoughts; but the instances are indeed few and unnoteworthy where they have exerted any wide-spread wholesome influence on the moral life of community. Somehow, in a theatre, we think of everything going on as artificial. The scenery is but a poor copy of nature, and actors are not what they seem; and so we come to think of what is said as partaking of the unreal and fictitious. It is all a sham, virtue as well as everything else. This simulation, this confessed pretense and personation neutralize the effect of passages charged with divinest truths. They too belong to the phantasmagoria which, for the time being, entrance the audience and are as illusive as the sheet-iron thunder, the resin lightning, and the canvas bowers and glades of fairy-land. If there is anything calculated to undermine all confidence in the actual distinction between right and wrong it is excessive attendance on the drama. Acting! acting! nothing but acting! everything in this very real and solemn world becomes to him who is a devotee at the shrine of Thespian art. He is in danger of being stricken with the paralysis of skepticism, and of sneering at everything claiming to be moral or religious.

But supposing we are at fault in our philosophy, and that some plays are really fitted to quicken the ethical life of Society; yet how very few of them seem to be presented. The number is so small and is so greatly overborne by others of a pernicious character as to render their

influence trifling and imperceptible. Anyone who will take pains to watch the announcements in the newspapers, and the notices of the entertainments penned by the critics, must agree with us that the majority of theatrical performances tend toward immorality; and if so large a part of what is furnished as amusement is corrupting, and if even when the tone is better there are difficulties in the way of its proving effective, we must conclude that there is no other ground for the theory we are examining, than the luxuriant imagination of its special advocates. More than this, we seriously question whether the Stage, however reformed and purified, would ever really deserve to be regarded as a school of virtue. It might be made harmless, a pleasure without pain and a joy without sorrow. There is nothing necessarily wrong in dramatic exhibitions, and it is a shame that capable as they are of yielding delight they should be contaminated by anything vicious and debasing. But if they were so far renovated as to contain nothing fairly objectionable, so that the weakest soul could attend on them with impunity, they would yet fail on account of their essential nature—being only a "counterfeit presentment," an artistic chimera, a futile phantom—to accomplish what this pretentious assumption implies. The mission of the theatre is to amuse, and we shall not complain, nay we will praise it, if it discharges this function without making the people worse than they are. We do not ask it to make them positively better. If it could do so, of course, we would not object. But it cannot. Self-improvement, the correction of bad habits, the inspiration to personal goodness, are not sought within its walls. The public patronize it simply to be amused, and its business is to amuse. Amusement is the bond between them, and if the theatre will only honor it and do it without injury to the moral life of the community, the public can well excuse it for

not being what it was never designed to be, an instructor in righteousness and a fountain of godliness.

Thus far we have simply considered this institution in its relation with the audience; but to form an adequate conception of its character we must view it in connection with its servants. What a world of romance and glory do the wearers of "Sock and Buskin" suggest to the common-place plodder on the streets, and to the dull, dumb multitudes who never are allowed to penetrate behind the scenes! With what admiration beaming from their eyes do they behold the tinsel finery of puppet kings and queens, and with what envy do they see them sit on painted thrones and devour their Barmacide banquets. Judging by what they have witnessed on the stage—the lordly strut, the disdainful look, the elegant carriage, with all that accompanies them—they have pictured the player as vastly superior to ordinary men, as something remarkable and something eminently worthy the homage of their curiosity. If he or she enters a store the clerks scrutinize either with "awful" interest; and the possibility of acquaintanceship with such a one is more than "the wildest ambition" of some small tradesmen ever dreamed as possible. It is an event, an event to be spoken of, not generally, of course, but prudently and with appropriate winks, winks that denote more than can be expressed regarding the closeness of the friendship formed; and with self-congratulatory melancholy smiles of commisseration for the unprivileged creatures who are precluded from this felicitous honor. In a word, to scores of outsiders performers are human wonders, without particular cares or burdens, living in an ideal and blissful realm, and acting their several parts without study or fatigue. But—and we really are ashamed to write what will give others pain—all this is a misconception, a pleasant illusion and a little bit of inane hero-worship. Actors are not the fortunate beings which

the imagination of the uninitiated portrays. Just the contrary. As a rule their life is a toilsome one, poorly recompensed, full of privations, trials and disappointments. Not many among them ever succeed, and when they do not their income is frequently precarious, and their personal comforts few and far between. They have no permanent abiding place, especially since the adoption of the abominable itinerant system ; and hence they are unable to form home-like habits or taste the joys of the domestic hearth. At times their clothes are seedy, of poor material and unpaid for. They are betrayed by managers, assailed by boarding-house keepers, cut up by the press and exhausted beyond all patience by long and monotonous rehearsals. Often with heavy heart and unfilled stomach the actor or actress has to make his bow, play his part and seek applause from those whom he does not esteem very highly. She also has to dance, to sing, to smile, while her thoughts maybe are with a poverty-stricken mother, or with a helpless family of fatherless ones. Her time is not her own. Possibly she is only engaged for utilitarian business, or for what is called among professionals "the walking ladies" *role*, or, for what is still less dignified, the ballet, and she must go through her performance whatever her private griefs, not being of sufficient importance to obtain temporary release for the decencies of private sorrows. Significantly, though sadly, writes a rhymer:

> Only a ballet-girl lightly she trips
> Over the stage in her tinsel and lace,
> She forces a wearisome smile to her lips ;
> What cares may lie hid 'neath the paint on her face!
> She thinks, as she dances, of dear ones at home,
> Of needs which must wait, and of bills she must pay;
> And sometimes her fancy will hopefully roam,
> As she thinks of the coming of treasury-day.

Nor is this wearisome bondage only experienced by

those who fill subordinate positions on the stage. The leaders, the "bright and particular stars" of the profession, give anything but an attractive account of their calling. A little talk with them speedily dispels all illusions regarding their exemption from ills which most of us have to endure, and show that they are as taxed, fretted, worried and burdened as the rest of us. Thus, for instance, Maggie Mitchell, in the "Symposium" already referred to gives the public an idea of her overworked life. We quote a few sentences:

My own days, spent most of them far from my children and the comforts and delights of my home, are full of exhausting labor. Rehearsals and other business occupy me from early morning till the hour of performance, with brief intervals for rest and food and a little sleep. In the best hotels my time is so invaded that I can scarcely live comfortably, much less luxuriously. At the worst, existence becomes a torment and a burden. I am the eager, yet weary, slave of my profession, and the best it can do for me—who am fortunate enough to be included among its successful members—is to barely palliate the sufferings of a forty weeks' exile from my own house and family.

How different such a career as this from the one excited fancy attributes to the histrionic artist. "Harlequin," says Thackeray, "may carry a heavy heart beneath his spangled shining suit"; and we have no doubt but that multitudes who tread the boards are distressed, desponding and almost despairing. Perhaps this is no more true of them than of people in other callings; but what adds to its pathos and impressiveness in their case is, that they have to entertain others while they are themselvess suffering. No wonder the Greeks imparted to the mask of Thalia an expression of sad, scornful irony; for to our way of thinking there is nothing so pitiable and incongruous, or so full of mockery, as a discouraged, dispirited and almost heart-broken man or woman arrayed in festive garments and playing a comic part for the

amusement of gaping throngs. No wonder that some among them become reckless, take to drinking and end their earthly course as impecunious bloated idlers or as maudlin imbeciles.

A certain Miss Willee, of the Gaiety Theatre, London, is reported as saying that all her sisters of the drama are not "tarred with the same brush." Sincerely we believe it; and from what we have known of them we are confident that not a few of them resist temptations to evil courses. Yet we cannot ignore the fact that unfriendly critics of the stage usually speak in coarse, unguarded terms of those ladies who have adopted it as a profession. This is a gratuitous insult. No one has a right to take up an accusation against any class of people, and without proper qualification repeat it to the discredit of all, when only some—and even though many—are really guilty. A slander is as much a slander when retailed about actors as about anyone else; and the good name of an actress is as precious to her as to any other woman.

Especially have theatrical performers a right to considerate treatment—for those among them who preserve their integrity do so in the face of teriffic odds. Their calling is not favorable to the cultivation of blameless conduct; and, therefore, when they successfully resist the tendencies that would drag them down, the more deserving are they of commendation. Almost everything connected with the stage is inimical to the formation of correct principles and good habits. In every community there are vapid, luxurious, and licentious individuals who look on all actresses as their natural prey, who dog their steps, simper and wink at them from proscenium boxes, wait for them at the theatre's entrance, follow them home, besiege them with perfumed silly notes, flowers and presents, and are bold and impudent in their shameless solicitations. Not a few of their intended vic-

tims are poor, and feeling that they are under a social ban, are inclined to avail themselves of a "protection" which carries with it personal degradation. Then some managers connive, let us hope not always intentionally, with these lascivious creatures in effecting the ruin of gay and thoughtless girls, whose reputation they ought to guard, not imperil. They permit fashionable loungers behind the scenes, afford them opportunity of conversation with these girls in the greenroom, and in other ways practically pander to vices which they ought to deplore. Moreover, the public is not altogether clear of responsibility in this matter. Society people will patronize a Bernhardt and a Langtry as well and as freely as they will an Anderson or a Modjeska, and from this it is to be inferred that in the theatrical profession a fair name is not necessary to success. In every other calling that claims to be legitimate a personal worth is indispensable to prosperity, or at least the reputation for personal worth is essential. This is particularly true in regard to women. Female bookkeepers, physicians, teachers, and lady-workers in other departments dare not defy social sentiment on the question of morality, or indulge in flagrant transgressions of the laws of propriety. The notable exception to this wholesome state of things is the Stage. There a frail character is just as likely to achieve notable triumphs, if distinguished by rare ability, as a Charlotte Cushman or a Mrs. Siddons; and the tendency of this indifference to virtue on the part of the audience is to provoke like indifference on the part of the players.

Nor should it be overlooked that the nomadic life which actors lead, having no permanent abiding-place, and being continually subject to excessive excitement, exposes them to special temptations. They are not likely to feel the restraints which exist where one is identified with a particular community, nor are they apt to realize the necessity for

freedom from stimulants or the importance of keeping clear of debt. Admirers repeatedly and insistently offer them drink, and "wine them and dine them" in return for the pleasure their company affords; and they themselves are in danger of seeking its assistance to counteract the effect of their nerve-debilitating labors. Likewise, they are frequently reckless in money matters, so that while they are usually generous to a fault, having an open hand to the cry of distress, they are often slow to pay what they honestly owe. They may have no intention to defraud anyone. We do not accuse them of that. The explanation of their careless conduct is to be traced, not so much to a native lack of integrity, as to their Bohemian existence, which, with its many irregularities, fosters loose views concerning financial obligations. Then, in addition to this, the peculiar nature and claims of their profession are unfavorable to the cultivation of sound principles. It requires them to impersonate so many and such varied characters that they are in danger of forgetting that they have, or ought to have, one of their own. The assumption of roles so opposite to each other, and the artistic endeavor to become identified with each, must render it difficult to preserve their own identity. A man's vocation is generally acknowledged to exert a molding influence on his thoughts and conduct. There is, in other words, something of the "shop" about the members of guilds, crafts and pursuits. Now, if what we are most concerned with has power to impart itself to mind and heart, to build itself, as it were, into the very structure of character, we ought not to be surprised if actors should incline toward the artificiality, the instability and romanticism of their calling. Everything about them tends to pretense, and to belief in its efficacy. Scenery with the backs of the "flats" unpainted is just as serviceable as something more substantial and real; fictitious gems and splendors of every

kind, and the hocus-pocus, the humbug and the catch-penny arts are just as useful in swaying and thrilling an audience as genuine diamonds and laces, or as veraciousness in all methods and appliances. They see that the world "is still deceived by ornament," that a lie faithfully simulating truth, and a sham fashioned to resemble substance, will apparently go as far with it and win its applause as the reality. They live in a domain of phantasmagoria, and that, occupying by far the greater part of their time and thought, is likely to follow them, and to disfigure their private life. One illusion following another in swift succession, and crowding on every side, must have some degree of educational power, and must render it hard to escape the impressions that morality itself is also largely an illusion.

To resist such misleading and confusing influences necessarily must require extreme sensitiveness of conscience, great will-force, and much buttressing and fortressing of the soul with clearly defined principles of right-doing. No language possibly can do justice to the heroic struggle demanded in these singularly unfavoring circumstances to maintain integrity and purity. Therefore, we confess to almost unmeasured respect for the actors and actresses who preserve unstained their good name, and who are practically saints in most unsaintly surroundings.

In all of these representations we have aimed to be perfectly candid and fair; and if they are indeed just, then there can be no doubt but that the theatre ought to be recast and remodeled. This conclusion we apprehend very few persons whose opinion is worth anything will seriously challenge. But there is not similar unanimity as to the means fitted to accomplish the work demanded. At this point differences appear. Some friends of reform write and speak in such a way as to create the

impression that the Church could remedy existing evils if she would only take them in hand. With the most charming confidence it has been asserted that her members ought to assure managers of their willingness to support the legitimate drama, and no other; and that were they to do this a strong impulse would be given to its revival. But these gentlemen already know the difficulties in the way of earnest Christians attending the theatre, and any number of resolutions would not enlighten them further; and they also have reason to believe were indecencies removed many of them would patronize the drama; because not a few of them—whether "earnest" or not we do not pause to inquire—patronize it now in spite of its demoralizing tendencies. What is needed more than any "assurances," is that, to speak professionally, the managers should take their "cue" from the views of the Church, often repeated, and act accordingly. In other words we sincerely believe that the initiative must be taken by those who have charge of the Stage, who know its abuses, and who in the nature of things are mainly responsible for their correction. We are not exonerating Christians from blame, or excusing them from effort, in regard either to the disease complained of or the cure. Only we are convinced that what they have failed to do, and consequently what they ought to do, is to educate public sentiment against the obscene, and the trashy. Theatrical directors are caterers not reformers; they feel called on to gratify the public appetite, not to improve it. They have yielded continually to pressure; and one of the most irreproachable and most cultivated of those who reside in Chicago even succumbed to what he regarded as a popular demand, and in the teeth of all the Christian sentiment in the city consented to have his theatre open on Sunday. This shows that there is a special work to be undertaken by the Church.

In Sunday school, in the pulpit, in the family she must warn against the pernicious in amusements. With candor she must discriminate between good and bad, between excess and moderation, between art and the degradation of art. Her particular mission lies more with the audience than with the stage, more with the depraved multitudes who clamor for demoralizing sights and scenes than with the weak and dependent performers whose interests incline them to comply; and her invectives should be launched primarily at Society for the character of the entertainments it patronizes, not at the theatre for furnishing the entertainments. If she will only elevate the moral tone of the former, the moral tone of the latter will be forced to change for the better.

To managers and to leading performers belong the direct task of reforming the profession. They must take the initiative. Outsiders cannot interfere successfully in their business. May we not with propriety ask what they have ever done to redeem their vocation from the evils which disgrace it? We know they have resented censure, and have indulged in eulogies of what the drama was designed to be, and of what it might be; but what have they actually done to render it what it must be if ever it is to deserve the approval of the wise and good? Some things they might have done which they have failed seriously to undertake. They might form themselves into a guild, as the bankers have done, and the various trades, and they might agree among themselves to banish demoralizing plays from the "boards," and to exclude from their companies disreputable females and dissipated and dishonorable men. They might also forbid the sale or use of intoxicants on their premises, and refuse to admit infamous women to the auditorium, and equally infamous specimens of the opposite sex to the greenroom. Moreover, were they so inclined, they might prevail on the

law-makers to permit no saloon to be located any nearer to a theatre than to a school-house; and they might decline to employ any person in any capacity whatever who habitually spends the midnight hours in the resorts of drunkards. They might honor the Sabbath day, thus giving to their employés not only a season for recuperation, but opportunity as well to emerge from the dominating control of the artificial; and they might, likewise, break up entirely, or materially curtail, the present itinerary system which has done so much to deprive actors of the home and the restraining and elevating influences of a settled habitation. All this they might do. Nor is this much to require at their hands; nor is there anything in it unreasonable or burdensome. They are asked to do nothing that is not commonly done in other respectable employments; and if they are unwilling to attempt this much, what confidence can be reposed in their expressed desires for reform, or what hope be entertained of the ultimate elevation of the drama?

While we have in these remarks defined the respective duties of the Church and the Stage, we would not have our readers overlook those of the State. The authorities have the same right to forbid corrupting exhibitions as they have to prevent obscene matter from being sent through the mails. They certainly can legislate drinking places away from the neighborhood of the theatre. If its vicious surroundings were broken up, the Stage would lose much of its attractiveness for the crowds who desire only food for coarse appetites and fuel for lust; and then it would be forced, in self-defence, to mend its ways that a different class of patrons might be drawn to its support.

But beyond this there is a special obligation resting on our civic guardians which they have very generally ignored, and which, if duly honored, would do much toward cor-

recting a morbid and depraved taste, whose pernicious effects cannot be accurately calculated. We have not referred to this before because we have not found a place appropriate to its introduction until now. What we have in mind is the employment of children. Mere infants are sometimes exhibited on the "boards" in various acts, and idlers crowd to see them, perhaps never adequately realizing that their efficiency has been attained at the cost of their childhood. A few years since in Boston a mere child who had been playing at one of the theatres died. He had attracted considerable attention and was regarded as a prodigy. But he had passed through severe discipline, and had suffered much in the course of his training. The unnatural excitement in which he lived, the polluted and stifling air he had to breathe each night, the late hours, the loss of sleep, and the terrible nerve expenditure, at last broke him down; and in a little while his troubled spirit had taken its flight to that world where there are no shows, and where there is no great public demanding tortured babies for its diversion. But before the boy-martyr ended his brief earthly career, he is reported, as death was chilling his blood and the shores of eternity were dimly visible, to have cried out in pathetic tones, "O God! O God!! is there no room yonder for a little fellow?" In this great world there had been no room found for his childhood, no room for play, for dance, and laughing sport; and as he was about to depart the horrible thought seems to have distressed his mind that even eternity might be so crowded, so full and so busy as to leave no room for him, and for the free-expansion and enjoyment of his child-soul. The suspicion was not unnatural; but we are happy in the confidence that it was ungrounded. There is plenty of room in heaven for these "little fellows"; and the only question is, whether there is any room there for the big, wicked fellows, who beat, pinch, starve and

abuse defenseless children, or for those other big, heartless fellows who find pleasure in exhibitions which they must know, or ought to know, have been produced at the cost of tears and pain. As we write these lines there is in a Pennsylvania prison a posture-trainer waiting trial for the murder of a tiny girl, who he was in the habit of flogging mercilessly with a strap whenever she failed to do what he told her, and whose life he finally beat out with a shovel.

In view of such cases ought not a stop to be put at once to juvenile acrobatic and other performances? Ought not magistrates and mayors to interfere and prevent these outrages? We believe that something decisive should be done in the premises, not merely on account of the children, but on account of Society as well. All entertainments that involve barbarous features, that are also physically hazardous, and that suggest preparatory suffering are injurious to the spectator. Such representations tend to harden the heart and to render it callous to human misery. They brutalize, and prepare the way for cruel child-scourgings, wife beatings, and ferocious murders. The taste for the horrible in amusement seems to be increasing, as the titles of plays, illustrated posters, and newspaper criticisms abundantly prove. Blood-thirsty dramas are quite the rage, and thousands feast their eyes on scenes of simulated anguish, are fascinated and delighted by the mock agonies of writhing wretches; and it is not very wonderful that some among them should seek to perpetuate this pleasure by attempting to reproduce what they have witnessed in real life. Accompanying this thirst for savagery, we have a most depraved demand for deformities, monstrosities, and for the hideous and repulsive in humanity. Hence the multiplications of "Dime Museums," "Chambers of Horrors," and other similar places where the misshapen and distorted are exhibited. Are our readers aware how these "curiosities" are generally supplied? Probably few

among them have ever paid any attention to the subject. Had they done so they would have felt outraged as we felt when we discovered that they were "manufactured" to meet the public craving for the unsightly and misproportioned. On this point Victor Hugo has written eloquently when explaining the misfortunes of Gwynplanne; and Charles G. Leland has also given some account of the terrible business in the following extract from one of his letters published in the Chicago *Tribune:*

> The gaping rustics and other fools who gaze with wonder on the big-headed boy and the youth with a head set the wrong way, and other human monstrosities, are not aware that these are produced artificially by unprincipled scoundrels of broken-down surgeons and by processes of incredible cruelty. The familiar of the Inquisition and the Red Indian never yet went so far as to keep a young girl or boy for six months or longer in constant excruciating agony, tied down to a table while the head and spine were being slowly twisted to a hideous malformation and the ligaments and muscles being gradually cut away. Well, all of this was done, not once but many times, a few years ago by a wretch named Harper in London, who regularly supplied circuses and shows with these horrible curiosities. Of course the proprietors knew how they were made. Yet when we reflect on the great number of "gentlemen" who think it manly or cynical to laugh at even such wickedness, it is not wonderful that the multitude like to see the results of it.

The magistrate surely has a solemn duty to discharge in these circumstances. Exhibitions of child-actors should be strictly prohibited, and the prohibition should be rigidly enforced ; and as to deformities, whether young or old, their appearance before an audience should be forbidden on pain of weighty penalties. The result of decisive measures in these directions, tending, as they would to refine the popular taste, would advance the interests of the legitimate drama. Suppression of the stimulants to cruelty, combined with a vigorous oversight of what is put on the stage in the cheap shows, where more regard is had

for the quality of the whisky than for the quality of the play, would aid at least in educating the community up to a just appreciation of what is worthy its approval in histrionic art.

These animadversions abundantly indicate the imperative necessity that exists for amusement-reform. But, while we are thinking of this, let us not forget the kindred duty of rendering it possible for the masses to partake with their more favored brethren of wholesome entertainments. We do not consider as we ought the hard condition of the lowly millions which practically cuts them off from refreshing recreations. As we write the street-car drivers and conductors of New York are memorializing their employers to reduce their hours of work to twelve. Just think what this modest request implies. It distinctly intimates that these men have no time for restful pleasure, and that they are doomed to a wearisome, unbroken round of slavish service. For them, and for multitudes like them, no cheery and gladsome social season is possible; and neither game nor song, nor harmless mirth brightens the dreary dead-levelism of their existence. Surely twelve hours are enough; but when they do not suffice the burden becomes a tyranny, a mean advantage taken of the necessities of the poor, and every generous soul should express its horror of the wrong inflicted.

The Rev. Edward E. Hale, than whom there is no truer man nor truer lover of his race, in 1877, before a Conference held in Philadelphia, thus describes a scene he had witnessed when visiting a certain Union for Christian work in Providence.

> I sat in the great amusement-room one evening, watching fifty or more young men and boys playing bagatelle, parlor billiards, checkers, chess, and the rest, and I wondered that not one woman joined in the games; for there were as many as twenty girls sitting by themselves in a corner looking on. I asked the lady in attendance

why those girls did not join in the games. She said they were too tired. Yet it was an entertainment for them simply to come into the warm room, and sit and look on. Think of that my dear madam. Remember that the girl who has spent eleven hours a day in the making of paper boxes, so that your embroidered handkerchief, for instance, may have a proper place to sleep in when you also go to bed, at the end of the eleventh hour, is very tired. She is too tired to read. She is too tired to listen to "improving lectures." She is too tired even to play dominos. She can only amuse herself by looking on.

And yet, these are our sisters, and the future mothers of our Republic whose drudgery is thus pathetically portrayed. What are we coming to when our insane greed deprives even these of recreation? We say to them "be amused" as the worldly professor of religion, satirized by James, says to the indigent, "be clothed, be fed;" but like him, we come not to their relief. Our desire to be rich is so intense that we rob these poor girls of their strength, and thus effectually exclude them from the relaxation which their age and sex demand. Millions of others all over the world, both men and women, youths and maidens, are also banished by the bitter hardships of their lot from everything that is fitted to yield them pleasure. Onward they move, a cheerless procession into ever-deepening gloom of moody melancholy; and their piteous moans are passed unheeded, and their cry for some respite from the sorrowful darkness is denounced as a threat against the peace and order of Society. Philanthropists and Christians in a multitude of instances profess the deepest sympathy for them, and yet hesitate to advocate the only course that can deliver them from their evil plight. These well-meaning persons are willing to provide them rooms for social gatherings and harmless games, but still they exact, as others do, such exhausting hours of toil as neutralize their benevolent intentions. When will we learn common sense? When

will we see that the poor need not our petty gifts, our toys and baubles, half as much as leisure and strength to enjoy them? Hazlitt declares that players are "the only honest hypocrites." "They are, as it were, train-bearers in the pageant of life, and hold a glass up to humanity, frailer than itself. We see ourselves at second-hand in them." Ah! may not the suspicion be entertained that Philanthropists and Christians also are at best but "honest hypocrites," assuming the role of "benefactor," while they are undesignedly crushing beneath an iron-shod foot the bleeding heart of dependent multitudes. It is said, that Charles VI. when authorizing the actors to represent the "Mysteries of the Passion," styled them his "loved and dear co-mates;" and Michelet asks, "what could be juster?" "A hapless actor himself, a poor player in the grand historic mystery, he went to see his co-mates—saints, angels and devils, perform their miserable travesty of the Passion. He was not only spectator: he was spectacle as well. His people went to see in him the passion of royalty." And to our way of thinking, these men with high-sounding titles associating them with the loving Christ, are practically "co-mates" with the lordly and worldly company whose conscienceless exactions perpetuate the mysterious Passion of humanity; and so long as they shall fail to adopt a course in actual harmony with their benevolent pretensions, they too will remain mere "spectators" of sufferings they ought to alleviate; and, what is worse, a "spectacle" themselves of impotent and scepterless royalty.

Here ends our paper, and it ends not as hopefully as we could have wished. A bitter termination this to a chapter on amusements. Would that we could in honesty have written otherwise! Impossible, however, such a feat with all the sad facts before us, and which could not fairly be ignored. We have tried "to set down naught in malice;" but we have been compelled to pen what has filled

our own heart with sorrow ; and as we close our painful task we can but adopt the melancholy *envoi* of the Master Showman of Vanity Fair :

The play is done; the curtain drops,
Slowly falling to the prompter's bell;
A moment yet the actor stops,
And looks around, to say farewell.
It is an irksome word and task;
And when he's laughed and said his say,
He shows, as he removes the mask,
A face that's anything but gay.

IX.

THE EDUCATION OF SOCIETY.

There is an inmost centre in us all,
Where truth abides in fullness ; and around
Wall upon wall, the gross flesh hems it in,
This perfect, clear, perception—which is truth;
A baffling and perverting carnal mesh
Blinds it, and makes all error ; and, *to know*
Rather consists in opening out a way
Whence the imprisoned splendor may escape,
Than in effecting entry for a light
Supposed to be without. * * *
* * * Men have oft grown old among their books
To die, case-hardened in their ignorance,
Whose careless youth had promised what long years
Of unremitting labor ne'er performed.

Robert Browning.

JEAN PAUL RICHTER reminds us that "when Antipater demanded fifty children as hostages from the Spartans they offered him in their stead a hundred men of distinction." He continues: "The Spartans thought rightly and nobly. In the world of childhood all posterity stands before us, upon which we, like Moses upon the promised land, may only gaze, but not enter." If our good Jean Paul is correct, and that he is few, if any, will question, then no nation can afford to jeopardize its youth. Its own future greatness, dignity and happiness, are stored up in its infant citizens. We cannot penetrate the coming Canaan that is hidden in their souls; but we know whatever it may possess of beauty, richness and of fruitfulness,

when it is revealed, and when it is transferred to actual life, must largely depend on their early training. What they are, and what they are made, especially in the formative period of existence, America and Europe hereafter will be. We cannot, therefore, expose them to neglect or danger. The evil Antipaters of our age may take our men and women, though even these we should not yield without a struggle; but as for our boys and girls we must cry "hands off," we will not risk them in the merciless grip of vice and ignorance. Adults, whether leaders or followers, are already developed and molded for weal or woe, and comparatively little now can be effected for their improvement, unless it be accomplished by the grace of God. They may, of course, be benefited in some small degree by books and study, but they cannot be recast and refashioned by merely human agencies. It is, however, happily different with children. They are pliant, ductile, plastic, and wait the touch of the sculptor's hand. Jean Paul tells us that the old fresco painters laid their colors on the wet plaster, and as they faded renewed them until they became permanent in gleaming brightness. So the young mind is absorbent, and what it receives in early years is the foundation of future acquirements; and though it may seem to disappear it is still retained and imparts tone and hue to everything that comes after. When the metal is fluid it can easily be run into any mold, and when the lake lies radiant in the summer sunlight any keel may furrow its placid bosom; but cold iron resists even the stroke of heavy hammers, and a frozen sea checks with its rigidity the adventurous attempts of mightiest ships to invade its solitude. So when the soul is fresh from the Creator's love it can readily be shaped into almost any character; but afterwards, especially in the season of maturity, it is with difficulty modified even by severe and bitter experiences; and ice-locked by prejudice and dominant habits, it resents

the intrusion of any new voyager who would sail across its mysterious depths. Of course we are not teaching that education is completed during the morning hours of existence, or that it can be carried forward mechanically and without the coöperation of its subjects. We believe that it is progressive, extends, through life, and depends as much on the diligence of the student as it does on the faithfulness and fitness of the instructor. We are of those who smile at the enthusiastic youth who telegraphed his mother when he had successfully passed his examination for graduation at Yale,—"Educated!" Perhaps he himself laughed heartily at the irony of his dispatch; but whether he did or not the fact remains the same that he had only reached a definite stage in the history of his personal development, that others lay before him, and that what he was when he left the college, and what he is today or shall be in coming years, must be in a good degree attributed to his own endeavors.

Primarily, it is the duty of the parent to care for the education of the young. No decree of government and no State system of adoption can exonerate him from his obligation; neither can the latter agency ever entirely supersede him without detriment to the child. Fathers and mothers cannot without recreancy to their trust depute their office to any corporation under heaven. They may with propriety avail themselves of facilities, either public or private, that are within their reach; but however high the grade of the school they patronize, or however skillful the teacher they employ, they ought themselves to exercise an oversight of everything pertaining to the training of their children. Unhappily at this point they are frequently careless. They often take for granted, because their boys or girls are in some academy, that all is being done for them that can be done, and that they are personally free from further con-

cern. In this fatal delusion they generally continue until some misdeed or some glaring evidence of incapacity on the part of these home-neglected ones arouses them to the truth. Then they perceive that they themselves are not without fault; that they have not only failed in direct superintendence of what has been committed to instructors, but have deprived their sons and daughters of the benefits arising from close and intimate relations with their parents. In not a few instances the dereliction of the father leads to dereliction on the part of the mother; he is absorbed in business, she in fashion; he in politics, she in public reforms; he in angry disputes about nothing, and she in endless gossip about less—and in the meanwhile their sons and daughters grow up as they may, which at the best is badly enough.

But however devoted heads of families may be to this sacred mission, they cannot fail to be materially aided by outside educational appliances. We would never, or if ever, only in peculiar circumstances, encourage attempts to train a child in the retirement of home. However admirable the tutors may be, there is an exclusiveness about such a method not in accord with American ideas, and on the whole its results are not so satisfactory as we could wish. The schoolhouse, the comparative independent position of the teacher, the intercourse, and even the rivalries and competitions, have all advantages for the scholar. By these his ambition is aroused, his self-reliance is promoted, his latent powers are quickened and habits of self-application are fostered.

The Common School system of our country is the fruit both of sound philanthropy and of sagacious patriotism. It provides for the children of rich and poor alike, in a measure remedies the inequalities of social position, and removes impediments from the path of the unfortunate. In the proper sense of the term it is not charity; for

while it is philanthropic in spirit it really confers what is the right of every one, having been adopted by all for the sake of all. If it is open to any criticism—and here we refer exclusively to its underlying principle, and not to details of administration—it is, that it countenances "paternalism" in government, and seems to run counter to that "individualism" which is so marked a feature of our institutions. This implication is unquestionably just, and we have no desire te controvert it. But while we concede what is indeed undeniable, it should not be overlooked that this type of "paternalism" is very different from that which we have reviewed, and in its operations does not interfere with individual enterprise, or with the full exercise and unhampered expression of individual freedom. Our Common Schools are not designed to teach our future citizens that the State is henceforward to think for them, and act for them, but rather to qualify them to think and act for themselves. They are not intended to encourage their pupils to rely on an official bureau, but to rely on their own common sense and energy. They may not entirely succeed in carrying out this purpose, nevertheless it is this, and none other, that is contemplated in their creation. It may also serve to justify the kind of "paternalism" involved in their organization to remember that they are in an important sense a measure of national defence. As the State is empowered to raise an army and a navy for the protection of the country from foreign aggressions or domestic insurrections, so is it also bound to shield itself from dangers springing from ignorance and stolid stupidity. Intelligence and morality are absolutely indispensable to the security and perpetuity of free institutions; and, consequently, as self-preservation is one of the first laws of personal existence, and must be equally a primal duty of a commonwealth, their culture cannot with safety be neglected. Indeed so reasonable is

this principle, that it is questionable whether it is carried as far as it ought to be. We are inclined to believe that it is not. "Compulsory education," as it is termed, though generally recognized as sound in theory, is not uniformly enforced in practice. Inadequate legislation and the indifference of the people, are doubtless to blame for the failure to bring all of our children under the influence of some school, either public or private. Reforms are, therefore, needed at this point. The law on the subject should be the same in all of our States, and should be impartially administered. No exceptions should be allowed. Every child should be compelled to attend somewhere that it may receive instruction.

There is a forcible objection to compulsory education, which, if it is ever obviated, will call forth a further exercise of "paternalism." We refer to the fact that many children are obliged at an early age to earn their own livelihood. If they shall be compelled to attend school who will undertake to feed and clothe them? Their parents may be vicious, and hence be unwilling to support them; or they may be poor, and consequently be unable to do so. On either supposition their support must be provided for. The great charter of our freedom defines certain inalienable rights, such as "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." These are the privileges of adults; but would it not be well to add "education," as this has assuredly much to do with the maintenance and enjoyment of the other three? It seems to us that this also is a right, and one in which the child should be protected by all the resources of the nation. He cannot care for himself, he knows not how to guide his conduct, and it does seem unjust that he should be handed over to ignorance and helplessness simply because his father and mother are either criminal or unfortunate. And this leads us to the conclusion that, under such conditions, the government should provide for the necessities of children,

rather than permit them to grow up uninformed and undisciplined.

Laws prohibiting their employment in mines, factories and in other species of toil should be enforced, and where they do not exist they should be enacted. If they were rigidly excluded from the labor market until they are fifteen or sixteen years of age, it would be better for them and better for the country. They would be physically stronger for this exemption, and we believe they would be morally better. Premature burdens exhaust the strength, and association with their seniors generally leads them to imitate their bad qualities. They are taxed before they can endure, and they are tempted before they are able to resist. Read this excerpt from a Boston letter, and ask what very likely will be the future of the class described:

> The omnivorous big stores here hive hundreds of little girls all day long, label them with a number, and apply to all the general and appropriate name of "Cash!" Of these one-fourth break down within five years and the other three-fourths do worse. Five-cent stores are increasing and swallowing up these infant clerks by the hundred. Infantile muscles patter about in these commercial penitentiaries from seven in the morning till nine or ten at night, month in and month out. The air is not fragrant, and sunshine never enters. These children may be seen going home by the score at eleven at night. They recreate at that time by gossiping with youngsters in the transition state between boyhood and youth at the corners and under brilliantly-lighted saloon windows, when the good Bostonian is at home and abed.

Such exhibitions ought to be impossible; moreover, at the age we have specified, the young would still have ample opportunity to learn a trade, to acquire business habits, or to qualify themselves for a profession; and in addition to this, their withdrawal from the pursuits in which they are now engaged, would diminish competition, would relieve various occupations from the curse of overcrowding, would tend to advance wages, and would thus

increase the ability of parents to provide for the sustenance of their families. Now, in this indirect way, the State could secure to many boys and girls, who at present are unable to attend school, the advantages of a suitable education, and that, too, without disturbing in any sense domestic relations. But it is admitted that there are cases where something more would have to be done. There are households where penury is a perpetual guest, which no efforts succeed in expelling. They are deserving and virtuous, and yet they cannot get rid of their gaunt visitor. Disease has come and the man has been a long while out of employment and bills have accumulated; or the babies have arrived somewhat too frequently, and what with doctor's fees, hard times, and just a little shiftlessness, a mere suspicion of it, nothing more, the older sons and daughters must earn at least enough to supply themselves with food and apparel. It seems like inconsiderate cruelty to force these children away from their work that they may be instructed in the mysteries of elementary knowledge. To meet the needs of those who are thus unhappily situated there should be established public institutions where the pupils should not only be educated, but where they should also be housed, clothed, and fed. They should partake of the general character of modest boarding schools; and it should be no more discreditable to be an inmate of such an establishment than to attend West Point, the expenses of which are paid by the people, or Harvard College, whose magnificent endowments, the gifts of philanthropy, far more than the fees of the student, keep open its doors. Nor need these proposed institutions seriously affect family relations.

We would not countenance any plan that disrupts the ties that bind parents to their children; and ours contemplates no such outrage. Wealthy and well-to-do fathers frequently send their boys and girls to some distant Acad-

emy, and when this course is pursued we do not accuse them of faithlessness to their trust, or denounce them for discarding their offspring. We know that they are not necessarily guilty of either crime. They are trying, at least generally, to do what is best for the lad, and if he is sick they go to him or bring him home and in various ways constantly manifest their interest in his welfare. So, likewise, we believe it possible to make the children of the indigent beneficiaries without alienating them from their parents, and without alienating their parents from them. Going to a State Boarding School involves no other sacrifices than have to be made when going to a private one. In the former there could be days for visitation, holidays and vacations, when family associations could be renewed, and in seasons of sickness the youthful sufferer could be cared for by his mother if it should be within her power to assume the charge. There is certainly nothing fatal to the permanence and integrity of the home in arrangements such as these. But it may be suggested that many persons would avail themselves of this provision to relieve themselves of responsibilities, and that it would tempt them to plead extreme and confirmed poverty for the sake of getting rid of their helpless little ones. Possibly such instances would occur. What then? Are we to permit thousands to be deprived of invaluable advantages, because the representatives of some hundreds are base enough to obtain them under false pretences? Men vote who have no right to do so, but we do not abolish suffrage on that account.

It has been said that Foundling Hospitals have had a tendency to increase illegitimate births. We doubt it, and no statistics can prove it. It never has been the custom for women to publish their shame; and as they have always had various ways of concealing it from the eyes of officials, we question whether any adequate idea of its

prevalence could be formed until these hospitals were established. But, admitting that they have had the tendency alleged against them, has it ever been estimated how far they have served to diminish infanticide and other crimes which need not here be specified? We believe that they have prevented many a case of child-murder, and have done much toward deepening the instinctive feeling that life is sacred. But even were it otherwise, shall they close their doors and leave the unhappy innocents to perish because their benevolent purpose may be perverted? We would not care to assume the responsibility of any such harsh and illogical proceeding; neither are we prepared to abandon the plan we advocate to relieve the worthy poor of a burden, at the same time conferring a boon on their children, because some who are unworthy would probably make it the occasion for imposition. But is it not likely that this difficulty is exaggerated, and that in the practical working of our scheme it would not be nearly as great as some imagine? People of any character are not usually willing to advertise their bankrupt fortunes and avow their incompetence to care for their own, as they would be obliged to do in applying for government relief. This itself would act as a restraint to prevent fraud. Then appropriate penalties would still further diminish the frequency of its perpetration; for the disastrous consequences of almost certain discovery would intimidate many. But still assuming that miserable miscreants would attempt, and succeed in the attempt, to deceive the authorities, it would be much better for the children's sake that they be withdrawn from their protection. The loss the nation would sustain through their trickery would be far less than it would ultimately suffer were their boys and girls to grow up under their influence. Being dishonest themselves, probably they would make their off-

spring dishonest also, and the evil thus perpetrated would be immeasurably worse than the imposition itself.

This thought calls to mind the criminal classes. They, too, have a progeny, inheriting shame and sorrow, and apparently with only the nefarious pursuits of their sires open before them. They are taught to lie, beg, steal, and the only ideas furnished them of life are presented in the drunkenness, cruelty and general viciousness of fathers and mothers. God help them! What can we reasonably expect from such a brood but pollution and villainy? How can we hope that they may rise superior to their circumstances?

We would have the State lay its strong hand on all such little victims; we would have it rescue them from their unhomelike homes; and we would have it separate them entirely from their parents or at least until these parents abjure their evil courses, and have it rear them at public expense. Confirmed dissipation proven beyond a doubt, and settled habits of crime, should be regarded as the death of parental rights, and the orphans should be adopted by the nation. This were indeed a wise "paternalism" on the part of the government; for by this means it would gradually diminish wrong-doing, would render life and property safer, and would decrease its annual expenditure for courts, legal processes and prisons. It will be said that the measure is exceedingly heroic, and we admit it; but only such treatment will ever materially lessen the number of outrages which at present appall Society. If there is ever to be a change for the better, we must begin at the fountain-head. The money-cost of such a reform would be inconsiderable in view of the beneficial results. Multitudes of ragged urchins would be taken off the streets; the work they do could be performed by older persons; we would save in the direction of penitentiaries and bridewells, and the entire community would be better and happier.

Herder has shown that all the nations received writing and the earlier forms of civilization from the teachers of religion; and in large measure may be traced to their influence subsequent advancement or enlightenment, the founding of schools and colleges, and the decisive triumphs of modern culture. If what they have contributed toward the promotion and extension of learning in the world could be blotted out, the density and prevalence of ignorance to day would be appalling. There is scarcely an Academy or a University in Europe or America that has not been fostered, if not originally established, by the followers of Christ. What the State itself has accomplished in this direction is mainly due to their inspiration. They have ever been leaders in this great enterprise, and in the future they cannot afford to be mere camp-followers; nor can Society afford to have them straggle into a position so ignoble. It is still their duty to create public sentiment on this subject, to stimulate the ruling authorities to right endeavors, to coöperate in all movements for the growth of popular intelligence, and to encourage by their liberality and consecrated energy the cause of, what is termed, "higher education." While we express this conviction, we do not believe that the Bible holds the Church responsible for the secular school, either for its origin or support. She is indeed to advocate it, plead for it, and sacrifice, if necessary, on its behalf; but it is not her business by any divine decree to insist on superseding the civil powers in its formation or direction. We readily concede were the State oblivious to its obligations and determined to enshroud the people in mental night, that she ought to take the matter in her own hands, and, as far as possible, avert so terrible a calamity. This she would be justified in doing under the general commission she has received to champion everything relating to the elevation of mankind. In some circumstances this course would be legitimate

enough. What we claim is that the Church has no foundation in the Scriptures for the assumption of exclusive control over every department of education; and that what she may be bound to do under exceptional conditions is no rule for her guidance under different conditions. We all know that Sacerdotalism asserts a prerogative, a God-imparted authority over the human mind, and that in consequence its training must not be entrusted to any hands not priestly. Churches animated by this spirit are not slow to denounce our common schools as "godless," as "seminaries of infidelity," and they do not hesitate to demand that the youth of the land should be committed to their care. This arrogant pretension, without basis either in religion or reason, has found an echo in some Protestant circles, and we have been treated to essays on the need that exists for parochial schools. In these efforts to revive Mediævalism it is quietly taken for granted that secular instruction is injurious, and is condemned by the inspired writers. Neither of these representations can be proved; and we regard the position taken, not only as untenable, but as an attempted usurpation which every freeman is bound to resist.

To the Church has been specially confided the spiritual development of humanity; and in this work she is practically without a rival, except in the domain of the family. She may, if she so pleases, establish her own schools and found her own universities, where the arts and sciences can be studied under her personal superintendence; but she has no right to proscribe similar institutions begun and sustained by the civil government as an invasion of her prerogative. All that she is really empowered to do, all that the Almighty holds her accountable for, is expressed by the phrase "religious enlightenment." The duty suggested by these words she cannot neglect without guilt, neither can she escape cen-

sure if she discards it or seeks to depute it to other agencies. She is the Divinely appointed and qualified teacher of the conscience and the heart; and this honor is so great, and the mission itself is so sublime, that she may well cease to clamor for the absolute and exclusive control of the intellect.

Of late much has been written regarding the true ideal of education, and a vigorous effort is being put forth in various quarters, not only to correct erroneous conceptions of its nature, but to improve and even revolutionize its methods. The old system of cramming is being pretty generally denounced; and if the agitation continues, the most salutary changes may be expected. It is now being said, "that man, not scholarship, is the aim of education"; and in harmony with this thought a distinguished author has added, "Do not, like common cultivators, water the individual branches, but the roots, and they will moisten and unfold the rest." In a little book entitled *Guesses at Truth*, we are told that the end of all schooling is to "educe," or to call forth, and bring out whatever is within the mind, and is not primarily or mainly to "instruct," or to impose a form from without. According to this volume, we are to "nourish and cultivate the mental faculties, and not overcrowd them with a mass of information." John Stuart Mill's conception of this work includes, "whatever we do for ourselves or is done for us by others, for the purpose of bringing us nearer the perfection of our natures." Colonel Francis W. Parker, Principal of the Cook County Normal School, has expressed himself in full sympathy with this view. He insists on the development of thought-power, and does not attach much importance to the learning of mere words. He remarks:

> True teaching must be the adaptation of the subject taught to the learning mind. Whatever is above the mental grasp of the

pupil only serves to weary and disgust the learner, and consequently depresses all healthy mental action. Judging from the results within our knowledge, by far the greatest part of all school work consists in a useless pilgrimage through a barren desert of empty words—a fruitless Sahara.

John Ruskin, in *Fors Clavigera*, translates a passage from a Greek writer for the purpose of reviving a Persian idea of education which is not without interest and meaning to our generation. He refers to the training of a prince, some three hundred years before Christ was worshiped by the Magi, and presents the following account:

When the boy is seven years old, he has to go and learn all about horses, and is taught by the masters of horsemanship, and begins to go against wild beasts; and when he is fourteen years old, they give him the masters whom they call the 'Kingly Child-Guiders'; and these are four, chosen the best out of all the Persians who are then in the prime of life, to-wit: the most wise man they can find, and the most just, and the most temperate, and the most brave; of whom the first, the wisest, teaches the prince the magic of Zoroaster; and that magic is the service of the Gods; also, he teaches him the duties that belong to a king. Then the second, the justest, teaches him to speak truth all his life through. Then the third, the most temperate, teaches him not to be conquered by even so much as a single one of the pleasures, that he may be exercised in freedom, and verily a king, master of all things within himself, not slave to them. And the fourth, the bravest, teaches him to be dreadless of all things, as knowing that whenever he fears, he is a slave.

To the reader of these lines it must be evident that some of the ancients, at least, anticipated the ideal which is growing conspicuously prominent to-day. In this passage we have a striking picture, the principal feature of which is development. At first, the lad's physical powers are called forth, and his hand, eye and foot are carefully trained to do his bidding. He is not, therefore, sent into the world unable to look after himself, undisciplined, unskilled. His religious nature is then cultivated, love,

faith, and reverence being quickened and evolved. Following this, one teacher devotes himself to the cause of truth—so important was it regarded—and the royal pupil is influenced to render it sincere homage, and the latent respect for its claims, which lies enwrapped in the soul is evoked and strengthened. Then comes self-government, freedom from vice, implying that to the surface have been summoned the grandest and noblest qualities of our common nature. Of course the process of unfolding and expanding here described, demanded the communication of much "useful knowledge;" but it is to be observed, and this is the special point that concerns us, that the impartation of knowledge was not the end kept steadily in view, but was merely one of the instruments —example and experiment being doubtless others—for its achievement. We propose this model to the thoughtful consideration of all those who are interested in the training of youth. Separate from it all that is incidental and local, and retain the essential spirit, and we may go farther without finding a better illustration of what we should strive to realize in our age, and toward which we believe some of our more enlightened instructors and statesmen are surely, though perhaps slowly, approaching.

But before any such goal as this can be reached, many things now tolerated must be entirely abolished, and reforms somewhat radical in character must be inaugurated. And one of the first changes needed Mr. Parton indicated in the *Atlantic Monthly* several years ago. When visiting Chicago he was impressed with the quality of the work done in its public schools; but when writing about them he did not hesitate to describe them as intellectual hot-houses where the mind was unduly forced, and that too at the cost of physical health. Prof. Mathews tells us of a New York paper in which he read "of a little girl

whose parents boast that she is so absorbed in her school lessons that she says them over nightly in her sleep." Poor child! how we pity her; and stupid father and mother, how we pity *you*. The grave is not far off, if it has not already opened to receive your treasure. The author we have just quoted also relates what an English editor observed of the task assigned a mere child:

> Besides lessons in orthography, etymology and syntax, she had others to learn in astronomy, belles lettres, music, drawing and political economy, with side issues, consisting of card board, needle work and Berlin wool, pictures of lemon colored sheep, kept from indigo lions by a saffron colored shepherd,—and the whole to be done up and finished in three hours.

The result of such cramming can easily be surmised. Nothing is acquired thoroughly. The mental faculties are gorged, and their tone and fiber suffer from repletion. Of the 10,000,000 young persons annually receiving instruction in America, how few there are who seem to be really profited by their studies. Their brain is frequently injured, and their health undermined. John Locke held a sound body to be of equal importance with a sound mind; and indeed the former can hardly exist without the latter. Professor Hall, in *North American Review*, says that he asked the masters of six city grammar schools, "How many of your boys have graduated sound in health to their teeth?" And "their replies have all ranged between three and fifteen per cent." In these answers he remarks: "I doubt, from the sallow complexion, the languor, the anxious, nervous, worrying tone so generally seen in the faces of our brain-worked girls, in high and normal schools, if the case is much better there." Well, if only fifteen per cent of the multitudes who pass through our public schools are physically whole, something must be wrong. Nor is this suspicion removed when we cast our eyes on college graduates, many of whom leave the

halls of learning, weak, fretful, dyspeptic and with such loss of vigor that comparatively few among them ever attain to eminence in their chosen professions. Evidently our educational methods are not what they should be. While pure air, perfect ventilation, out-door exercise and ample time to return home between sessions for an honest meal, instead of the indigestible lunches which are usually hastily swallowed, are imperatively requisite; fewer hours for mental application, a wiser adjustment of studies to the capacity of the student and to the end sought by the teacher, are equally important.

But, beyond all this, some changes are evidently needed to redeem our schools, and our higher institutions of learning, from the suspicion that they do not succeed as they should in preparing their pupils for the active duties of life.

Froude, in one of his *Shorter Studies*, notes the helplessness of many college graduates. He declares that they are prepared for the trade of a gentleman, and for no other trade; and he points out, what we must have observed in this country as well, the desire among young men for clerkships and office duties. This he looks on as an unpromising sign. Moreover, he quotes a cry that comes from Australia, which confirms his own opinion concerning the inability of not a few college-bred men to support themselves: "Send us," the people of the antipodes exclaim, "no more of what you call educated men, send us smiths, masons, carpenters, day laborers." These will thrive, "but the other is a log on our hands; he loafs in uselessness till his means are spent, he then turns billiard-marker, enlists as a soldier or starves." Miss Florence Nightingale is equally uncomplimentary when she observes that instruction in the three R's, unaccompanied as it now generally is by industrial training, is apt to lead to the fourth R, "rascaldom." In the same direction

tends a symposium on "Educational Needs" published two or three years ago in the *North American Review*, and from which may be gathered suggestions as to the cause and cure of the evil under consideration. Professor Hall lays stress on the importance of physical training, and quotes Fröbel's dictum. "The child is a plant and should live out of doors." He insists likewise on a deeper insight into children's psychic growth and activity, thereby following the plan both of Fröbel and Pestalozzi. Also, he agrees with Dr. Putnam Jacobi that ethical training, as it is properly called in these brief papers, is imperatively demanded. Professor Felix Adler charges that memory is cultivated at the expense of the understanding, that wholesale teaching is an evil, and argues that mental overtaxing should be avoided.

Evidently, if our boys and girls are to be rendered efficient, self-reliant and self-supporting men and women, they must be taught in such a way as to strengthen and invigorate the intellectual and physical nature, and the ethical must not be neglected. A youth with a thoroughly developed brain, sustained by a thoroughly sound body, and guided by a thoroughly enlightened conscience, will usually be wise enough to plan for his own maintenance, will be vigorous enough to execute, will be too independent to rely on others, and too correct in his principles to dream of subsistence without honest toil. We are satisfied that confusion of ideas, the failure to see things distinctly, resulting from the incoming of fog-banks of knowledge, combined with the effeminacy increased by sedentary habits, and the moral laxity which follows exclusive devotion to intellectual pursuits, constitute the roots from whence spring the tree, of whose comparative leaflessness and fruitlessness we have just reason to complain. Let the husbandry be changed according to the suggestions made by the authors of the "Symposium," and there can

be but little doubt that the tree will speedily become more attractive, and will yield abundantly. This, however, is not all that is demanded. There must be some grafting done. The practical must be systematically added to the theoretical in education; the concrete must find a place with the abstract; and the industrial and technical be joined to the scholarly and speculative.

Leibnitz, who seems to have foreseen the present emergency, regarded the teaching of arts and trades in public schools as of immense utility to the State. "Once," says Froude, "the ten commandments and a handicraft made a good and wholesome equipment to commence life with." But a handicraft is a difficult thing to learn in America, particularly by the children of Americans. The old apprentice system is pretty much gone, and what remains of it is mainly in the hands of foreigners, who seem intent on preventing the multiplication of skilled artisans. If then mechanic arts are to be taught in this land, and are to be rendered available to the thousands who must subsist by them or starve; and if the unfair restrictions of Trades-Unions, composed largely of alien-born workmen, are to be nullified and rendered inoperative, the nation must have recourse to the remedy suggested by Leibnitz. Rousseau, likewise took up this thought, and recommended that every child should learn a trade; and in the same direction run the sentiments expressed by Goethe to Eckermann: "Education makes of us bags filled with words, figures and facts." * * * "If we could only have less philosophy and more power of action, less theory and more practice, we might obtain a good share of redemption." Long before him, Aristotle taught that the games of childhood should have a bearing on the work of after years; Milton also advocated the imparting of knowledge more useful than Latin and Greek; and another old writer declared "that bookish learning is a poor stock to go upon."

It was the discernment of the principle underlying these statements that led Fröbel to desire and inaugurate the "Kindergarten," which calls into exercise intelligence and will, and which, while it supplies information of great utility, trains eye, ear and hand to apply what has been acquired. "The Kindergarten" is the primary department of "the Manual Training School," and when both shall be in successful operation all over the land we shall have the actual accomplishment of what the wise men, whose words we have quoted, were more or less distinctly hinting at, and we shall have secured a way of deliverance from an educational method that fails in a very vital sense to educate. The first of these institutions has won its way in public favor very rapidly, and may now be regarded as a settled fact; and the second is growing in popular esteem, and the day seems not far distant when a workshop will be permanently attached to every grammar school. France has several shops of this kind; and particularly in Bavaria does the government charge itself with the creation and support of such seminaries of industry. In our own country they are multiplying. They are already to be found, though not all as yet on an identical basis of support, some being maintained by the State, others by corporations, and yet others by individuals, in Philadelphia, Toledo, Baltimore, Chicago, and St. Louis; and either completely or in part, the system has been adopted and applied in Purdue University, Indiana, in the high school, Omaha, in Tulane University, New Orleans, in the universities of Minnesota and Wisconsin, and in the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Alabama. But those of our readers who desire to know more of this movement and of its progress, we advise to consult a volume by Mr. Charles H. Ham, issued by the Harpers. He has made a special study of the subject, and his chapters bristle with instructive facts and figures, and abound

in judicious and valuable reflections. On one point, however, there is really little need for testimony. We refer to the practical and material benefits of the system. Any one can see at a glance that it must conduce to physical development; and by promoting technical skill and taste for manual toil, will not only serve the cause of industry, but will render thousands of persons independent of outside assistance.

Perhaps this is as much as we ought to say in a general discussion, such as our present paper purports to be, on manual training. We pass, therefore, to another and to an equally important topic, namely, ethical culture. It will be remembered that nearly every writer we have quoted has called attention to its need and has emphasized its value. Charles Sumner, in one of his terrific appeals, compares a republic without education "to a human being without a soul, living and moving blindly with no just sense of the present or the future." But a human being without morals is a monstrosity, and a republic in which they are dead is a scourge. Kant declares that if in free countries men are not subject to discipline they incline to lawlessness which is barbarity. In such circumstances the peril is imminent. If in kingly governments abuses and corruptions creep in, the monarch or his ministers can be impeached; but, as it has been asked by another, who shall impeach the people when they are destitute of honor? A Charles I. or a Louis XVI. can lose his head, but what executioner can decapitate a nation? Clean gone from rectitude, abandoned to injustice and to vicious courses, it is swiftly tending toward destruction. To avert such a calamity a beginning must be made with the children, and in every school, from the lowest to the highest they must be trained in correct principles of conduct. Statesmen who deserve the name and patriots who are not counterfeits will feel an abiding interest in the art of

right-living, and will realize the importance of imparting its first lessons to the young. In our judgment, from the time a child enters the primary school, and throughout the entire course of after-instruction, his conscience should be enlightened and developed, and the law of duty in its application to every domain and relation of life should be gradually unfolded and illustrated.

Such a plan is not pursued at present. It is well-known that in our efforts to secularize education we have pretty much lost sight of ethics. In thrusting out religion we have likewise exiled virtue. Anxious to save our children from the sectarianism of the former, we have robbed them of the safeguards of the latter. Our school property has cost us $200,000,000, and we pay over $100,000,000 for teachers, and yet there is no perceptible diminution in crime or suffering; and if we may believe Professor Julius H. Seelye in the *Forum* (July 1886) they are both rather on the increase. It would seem that mere enlightenment is no safeguard against vice and crime. We know more than our fathers, but we do not act in a worthier manner. As Wordsworth complains, moral progress has not kept pace with the advance of intelligence. This may be in part accounted for by the little attention given to the subject in our institutions of learning. From the humblest to the proudest obligation is not thoroughly discussed, its source adequately explained, or its bearings made plain and simple. Ethical science we admit forms a study in our colleges, but there is not much time given to it; neither can it be said to rank in importance with the classics or with mathematics. A greater portion of a four-year course is devoted to the latter, while only some eight or ten weeks are given to the former. And what is worse, while professors and teachers are reserving the little they have to say on the individual government of life until the senior term, the boys are working out their own Decalogue,

and forming notions of what is honorable and upright, which would hardly receive the approval of Moses or of any competent casuist. It is not that Wayland's *Moral Science*, or that of any other qualified writer, is defective in its principles or misleading in their application; but rather that the science is pursued superficially, instead of being inwrought from the beginning of education in the habit of acting as numbers are in the habit of thinking. A lad is daily trained until he reaches manhood's estate in figures so that to calculate correctly becomes easy and natural; but he is not so trained in the more intricate problems of right and wrong; and indeed is generally left to his own crude ideas or his own passionate instincts, and when these have in some degree warped his character, the dignified professor takes him in hand and tries to force upon him views that are to him antiquated, ascetic and visionary.

Thackeray, in his fortunes and misfortunes of Pendennis, is justified in the sketch he gives of school dangers among the Cistercians; and his reflections thereon are worthy the consideration of parents in the new world as in the old. This is the passage:

> There were many of the upper boys, * * * who assumed all the privileges of men long before they quitted the seminary. Many of them, for example, smoked cigars—and some had already begun the practice of inebriation. One had fought a duel with an ensign in a marching regiment in consequence of a row at the theater—another actually kept a buggy and horse at a livery stable in Covent Garden, and might be seen driving any Sunday in Hyde Park with a groom with squared arms and armorial buttons by his side. Many of the seniors were in love, and showed each other in confidence poems addressed to, or letters and locks of hair received from young ladies—but Pen, a modest and timid youth, rather envied these than imitated them as yet. He had not got beyond the theory as yet—the practice of life was all to come. And by the way, ye tender mothers, and sober fathers of Christian families, a prodigious thing that theory of life is as orally learned at a great public school. Why, if you could

hear those boys of fourteen who blush before mothers, sneak off in silence in the presence of their daughters, talking among each other—it would be the woman's turn to blush then. Before he was twelve years old little Pen had heard talk enough to make him quite awfully wise upon certain points—and so, Madam, has your little rosy-cheeked son, who is coming home from school for the ensuing holidays. I don't say that the boy is lost, or that the innocence has left him which he had from "Heaven, which is our home," but that the shades of the prison's house are closing very fast over him, and that we are helping as much as possible to corrupt him.

This is not an unfaithful picture of school-life in our own times, especially in several of our higher institutions of learning. We were informed by an eminent divine of Cambridge, that he had seen young men helpless from strong drink lying on the college green. From what we have observed of students habits we can readily believe the statement. A lady of some prominence in society gave as the chief reason for withdrawing her son from a pronounced evangelical university, that the tutor, to whose tender mercies the youth had been consigned, took advantage of his position to whisper various objections to Christianity. She said with some warmth that she certainly did not send her boy to a school founded by religious men, and professedly attached to a great religious denomination, to have his faith undermined, and the bulwarks of virtue assailed. Had such been her purpose she could have effected it at less expense nearer home. She is not the only one who has noticed the insiduous attempts of some teachers to alienate the mind of their pupils from the gospel of Christ. A young man wrote his father, that it would be next to impossible for a student to be converted in his university, even if he desired that blessing. He meant that the atmosphere of the place was charged through and through with rationalism; and that cheap displays of intellectuality on the part of seniors and some of the professors rendered it difficult for spiritual aspirations to find scope and inspi-

ration. Where this indifference exists on the part of the authorities to the religious state of those entrusted to their care—and we rejoice to believe that it is not general—there is apt to grow in the mind of their wards the impression that as the faith of their sires is antiquated and irrational —learned doctors of laws and philosophy being judges—so also must be the morality whose authority is mainly derived from its sanctions. At any rate this seems to be the practical conclusion of many collegians regarding ethics, whatever may be their private notions concerning religion. Lads often take their first lessons in smoking, drinking, and something worse, in the town or city where dwells their *Alma Mater*. Now, as in the days of Thackeray's Cistercians, vices are changed to virtues in the moral alembic of candidates for academical honors. To evade their tasks, to bamboozle professors, to impose on good-natured parents, to play unmanly pranks, and to waste their time on nonsensical secret societies, are among the chief engagements of not a few undergraduates. Many of them, likewise, appear to exalt athletic sports out of all proportion to their importance above mental discipline and culture. They know more of boats than they do of Greek; they row better than they can write; they achieve more with their feet than they do with their brains; they can use the boxing gloves with more effect than the defenses of Logic; and they can calculate with greater nicety the probabilities of successs in games of foot or baseball than they can the simplest problems in Algebra. Physical development we concede is of great value, and ought not to be neglected; but when it is made an excuse for the systematic avoidance of study, and when it is so perverted as to become an encouragement to gambling and to the manners of the pot-house, it is at once a snare and a curse. Dr. McCosh, of Princeton, has expressed himself forcibly on this point, and has uttered a timely warning; and no one, surely can speak

with more authority and with less prejudice on a subject of this kind than he, who for years has devoted himself to the education of youth. But if confirmation of what we have stated is required, and if the testimony of Dr. McCosh is regarded with suspicion, we have it in the following brief extract from the *Hartford Courant*, which sets forth the evil of which we complain in no doubtful terms.

It is current rumor that a very large pile of money was "dropped" on the Yale-Harvard boat race. The *Boston Herald* reckons that devotion to the crimson cost the Harvard boys about $200,000. The ball match, it may be added, was not without its stakes, too. In each case Harvard was the favorite and Yale the winner. There is something highly disgraceful about this whole betting contingent of the college contests. The example is set, if the whole betting is not done, in both colleges by those rich and pernicious idlers, whose fathers send them to college for the sake of saying they have been there, and whose great wealth inclines the managers, in these money-serving days, to help them along in the hope of endowments from the parents. They are an injury to whatever college they attend. With their reckless expenditure, their profligate habits, their high scale of living, their idleness and their general futility; they do far more harm than their parents can undo with the uncertain charity of their last wills and testaments. They are the curse of the large colleges today. The only way to look at this boating and base ball diversion is as a sport—a side issue in a course of education which does not neglect bodily training. If the boys can keep up their studies and succeed in their sports, it is all very well; but it is a question whether they do not give too much time to the latter already. Certainly, any further emancipation from study for the sake of play in any of them is a mistake. Considering the abominable extent to which the betting and gambling have gone, it would be better today to cut off all the sport than to increase its opportunity.

In the opinions expressed by the editor we concur; and we do not think that anything need be added to show that there is serious lack of ethical training in some of our most notable seats of learning. The reference in this article to prodigal idlers has been echoed by Mr. Saltonstall in his depreciation of the growing extravagance of

Harvard; and has been met by President Elliot with the explanation: "that the students who are extravagant are the sons of rich people who have no experience of wealth." This may be the case—though we are not quite convinced that it is—but we fail to see how it mends matters. "The new rich" may be to blame; but, at the same time, is it not true that university overseers are also to blame for not insisting that the "new rich" keep their shoddy displays and their riotous conduct at home, and not render them a source of temptation to those who in their silly desire to imitate them, disappoint their self-sacrificing parents and blight their own future. If the scions of our recent plutocrats cannot be kept within the bounds of correct and modest living let them go to the bad elsewhere, and not in colleges; for no "endowments" from their parents can compensate for the ruin they bring to poor and struggling students. Unless a change is wrought in this regard very speedily, and unless moral training comes to be dealt with more earnestly and thoroughly than at present, it will indeed be a hazardous experiment to let a boy go to a great school. The venture even now is a grave one, and we have often thought warrants the scathing saying of Dr. Todd of New Haven, that if he had his way there should only be two colleges in the United States: one in the East and the other in the West; and the eastern one he would locate in Nova Scotia, and the western in the Sandwich Islands.

It is not unlikely that the discipline of our schools is superior to what it was in former times. Unquestionably there has been improvement in some directions. This we neither dispute nor deny. What we have written has not been penned for the sake of drawing comparisons or contrasts between the past and the present; but rather that we may perceive an existing evil which cries out for immediate remedy. So portentous and threatening is this evil that in the *North American Review* two or three years

ago the question was seriously discussed, with the weight of the argument on the negative side, whether or not there would be any morality in the future? Now such inquiries as these are exceedingly significant, and, in a word, are symptomatic of approaching confusion and convulsion in the domain of right and wrong. Is this threatened disaster to be averted? Do the interests of Society demand that it should be prevented? If so, then it is more important that we look things squarely in the face, than it is to spend our strength in showing that our colleges on the whole are better managed and are less frequently shocked by scandalous proceedings on the part of students than they were in "the days of yore." Let us admit all that can be claimed in their favor; nevertheless, it must be conceded, if reforms have taken place, that more are needed, and cannot safely be delayed. To save the age from immorality childhood and youth must be carefully trained in the ways of righteousness. They are our hope. Let us see to it that they do not become our despair; and our despair they will be if they are permitted to grow up with loose ideas regarding their obigation to God and man.

Our first duty is to see that ethical science in some form becomes part of even elementary education. The Bible has been removed from many of our public schools, and probably will never be restored. We cannot but regret that the biography of Jesus should be prohibited, and that multitudes of children should be deprived of the only opportunity they have of sitting as learners at His blessed feet. Would it were possible to bring back that sacred Presence; would that Romanists and Protestants would unite in placing before the children a portraiture of Him who has no sympathy with their sectarianism, and who longs, as of old, to lay His hands, rich with benedictions, on the heads of our little ones. But if this is impossible; if we think more of a so-called orthodox form than of the

real Christ; and if we believe that knowledge of Him apart from some sacerdotal ceremony or churchly rite may prove pernicious—God forgive our stupidity bordering on impiousness—can we not, at least, prepare a system of morals sufficient for the practical purposes of education, and to which all shades of religious opinion can heartily subscribe? We believe this is possible, and certainly this is needed. A commission composed of learned men, Jews, Catholics, Protestants and Theists, undoubtedly could agree, not only on what ought to be the rule of conduct, but on its true source and basis as well. On these subjects there is really no practical difference of opinion among religious people of every name; and the only persons who could object to their system of morals are those who deny the Divine existence, and who recognize no other authority than that of expediency. But these radical secularists are not entitled to very much consideration when we remember the gravity of the interests at stake, and the little their theory is capable of doing for the well-being of Society. The endeavor to build on the foundations of utilitarianism can never prove advantageous, as its principles too clearly resemble the shifting and treacherous sands for the structure reared thereon to be either trustworthy or permanent. To maintain that the supreme law of duty is essentially selfish, and that a man is only bound to do the best he can in existing circumstances, as is upheld by the advocates of Godless morality, is to abandon the weak to the strong, the simple to the cunning, and is to deprive charity, heroism and self-sacrifice of their significance and grandeur. Such a fatal and deadly end to all the ennobling possibilities of humanity is assuredly most discouraging and humiliating. While this must be evident to every candid reader, undoubtedly there will be those who, as they peruse these lines, will reply that even if what we have said is true, in this free land we have no right to

coerce the conscience of those who cannot subscribe to Theism and its corollaries. Such an objection as this we are inclined to respect; and yet is it not likely that in this instance the plea may be without sufficient reason? Let us admit that there is on this subject a conflict of consciences, and that either the majority or the minority must yield. On the issue regarding the Bible in the common schools the majority succumbed for the sake of peace, and because there was an appearance of sectarianism in preserving the custom of reading it to the scholars; but on the question of ethical culture, which is not primarily a religious question, and is one vitally connected with the prosperity and peace of Society, must the moral sense of the millions stultify itself to please that of the hundreds? This is not a conflict between churches, it is not a matter that concerns one sect as against the other; but is related supremely and directly to the State. Shall the scruples of a few impracticable individuals be allowed to override what the conviction of the nation regards as indispensable to the highest and truest welfare of the people? Experience has demonstrated that ethics, apart from the idea of a Sovereign Lawgiver and Judge, are in effect merely recommendations more or less beautiful and sentimental, which fail entirely in producing any marked beneficial results. Common prudence forbids that we trust so visionary and illusive a system. If, then, Theism is vitally related to morality, we surely would not be justified in abandoning it merely because a little group of eccentric ladies and gentlemen profess to feel aggrieved in their conscience that Atheism is not to be tacitly taught in our schools. We may be permitted to remind them that on distinctively ethical questions the minority has frequently had to submit; as, for instance, in the case of the liquor traffic. Some among us honestly believe in the suppression of the saloon; but, as we are out-voted, we have to tolerate its existence. If

we can put up with what is against our conscience, we may reasonably expect our infidel fellow-citizens to do the same. And from their own principles an argument can be framed to prove that they are bound to yield. It is well known that they insist on liberty. They contend that religion should not be forced on the young. We agree with them: only we also believe that neither should irreligion be imposed on their mind and heart. If they are to choose, they ought to have both sides presented. Assuming that this is fair, then it follows as atheistic parents will not instruct their children in Theism, they ought to be thankful to have it taught them elsewhere, especially as they in their turn have the privilege of instilling the opinions which they hold dear. Under these conditions the child can choose—not otherwise. But when parents say that he shall know nothing but the grounds for Atheism, then he will be as blind in his rejection of God as some persons are in their acceptance of inspired truth. We do not criticise their antagonizing at home the morality taught in the schools; but we hold that in the name of intelligence they owe it to their boys and girls that they be thoroughly enlightened as to its source and its precepts. In contending for this we are not proposing a wrong to be inflicted on their children, and we are guarding from injury those of the overwhelming majority.

But while ethical training should begin in the primary school, it should not end there. It should be continued in the college, and should be conducted practically as well as theoretically. By practical education in morality we mean such oversight, such discipline, and such surroundings as tend to beget the habits of righteousness. Saloons, gambling dens, and other places of infamous resort, should be made impossible in the vicinity of universities and other centers of learning. The expenditures of students should be regulated in some degree by the faculty or overseers;

and self-government should be constantly fostered and promoted, and every course likely to enervate and emasculate should be sternly rebuked. Games and sports should likewise be subject to wholesome regulations and restraints, and betting, with all of its low, vulgar associations, should be branded as thoroughly disreputable. The young men should be made to realize that collegians are expected to be gentlemen, and that ideas of honor such as prevail in sporting circles and in "fast" fraternities cannot be tolerated, and that the habits and manners of the turf and of the tavern are entirely out of place. While the observance of what is correct in form and the exercise of courtesy, may be carried so far as to become ridiculous, yet they cannot with safety be neglected, as everyone will admit who has observed with what facility our boys tend toward barbarism. Let a company of lads be together for a short time, and it is remarkable how speedily the coarse and uncouth side of their nature will develop. To check this trend in all schools, simple, genuine, good-natured politeness should be cultivated. This is itself a moral duty, and good-breeding is in a very real sense one of the moralities; for if we are bound to contribute to each other's comfort and happiness, it must have a claim upon us, as its amenities sweeten life and lighten many a burden. It will readily be believed that the president of a college will have much to do in determining the moral character of the youth entrusted to his care. His responsibility is a grave one. While it is usual for him to teach Ethics—and that science ought to be thoroughly taught in our great schools—he ought himself to be so commanding an illustration of its glorious principles as to awaken a sacred ardor on the part of the students to be like him. Some among our college presidents are taciturn, or are rough, cynical, morose, or are indifferent to the interests of those who look on them as examples. These men have no particular

sympathy with the young, and act towards them, not as a father, but rather as a grand Mogul, before whom inferior mortals should tremble. We are persuaded that the resignation of such leaders would be a real boon to community. They are in a false position, and should get out of it. Only those who are manly, generous, tender, and strong have any right to assume an exalted station in the cause of education. Professor Timothy Dwight, now president of Yale, long before his elevation gave in the *New Englander* his views of the duties of the office which he now holds. We quote a passage from his pen, accompanied with the sincere hope that he may be able to fulfill his own ideal:

> The President of Yale can be a university lecturer, lecturing on subjects which are of importance and interest to the students of all the schools! He can give different courses to a certain extent, adapted more particularly to the wants of each of the schools. If he is set apart by ordination to the office of the ministry, as always has been and we hope always will be the case in this institution, he can preach frequently in the university chapel or meet the students in their special or general meetings of a religious character. We know of no more noble work, more worthy of the highest powers or more truly honorable for a man who is fitted for it than to stand thus at the center of a great and growing university, with his heart and mind open to the wants of its every department—with his efforts ready to bear it forward in all parts alike—with the influence of his character and the impress of his intellectual power coming upon every student who finds his way anywhere within the walls of the college. The constantly increasing fame of the institution would be his fame. The lives of thousands of students would bear within themselves and would transmit to a future generation the lessons which they learned from him. His office would be a higher and better one than it would be now, just in proportion as it would have a wider sphere of action and a greater end to accomplish, and would be to its former self almost as the university is to the college.

The special feature of this description of what a president should be which most impresses us is that which refers to his personal influence on each student. We fully agree with the Professor that a president should come in

direct contact with every young man committed to his care; and we believe that he should aim to leave the imprint of his character on the freshmen where it will most likely do the most good. In this respect Dr. Martin B. Anderson, of Rochester, seems to be a worthy example. We have heard from various sources that he interests himself in every youth that enters the university, seeks to advise and assist him, and kindles in the breasts of all an earnest desire to be upright, independent and honorable. Such a teacher is himself the best treatise and exposition of ethics. Wherever he goes he creates an atmosphere of purity. His example is contagious. To be like him, as gentle, as honest, as just, as kind, becomes the aim of the generous fellows who are prepared enthusiastically to follow a chieftain fitted in every way to inspire confidence and respect.

Organized Christianity is chiefly accountable for the moral condition of Society; and consequently is especially bound to see that it is educated in all questions of right and wrong, however colleges or governments may fail in this regard. There are doubtless some persons who may dispute this confident assertion, declaring that the inculcation of religion is the sole duty of the Church. Religion is something more than morality; but, at the same time, it is the highest inspiration to morality. We admit that the Church is especially and Divinely appointed its advocate and teacher, and that she is bound to communicate its sweet and sacred principles to humanity. Their presence in the soul, with the corresponding response of the soul to their influence is an important part of education. This response many persons prefer to call "conversion," and we are not disposed to dispute terminology with them. But describe it by whatever name we please, it is the quickening, unfolding, and development of man's spiritual nature; and as such may without confusion of thought or heresy be defined by the word we have used. Whatever may

serve to promote this work the Church ought to support and befriend. Ethical science, grounded as it is in the fact of God's existence and providence, unquestionably contributes to its advancement, and consequently the Church is inexcusably guilty if she does not employ all her power to have it taught everywhere,—in the common schools and in the colleges of the land, as well as in the sanctuary. Whatever she can do to secure this end she should promptly and vigorously undertake, and she should permit no sectarian predilections to interfere with its success. But beyond all this, and as though there were no secular institutions of learning anywhere, she should devote her energies and resources to moral culture. Her Sabbath services, and her week-day prayer meetings, and her Sunday schools, are means now happily employed in this holy cause; and yet, we presume few will dispute the proposition that these may be rendered more efficient than they are, and may be ably seconded by new measures. For, instance, Young Men's Christian Associations are a modern expedient, and they have been eminently successful in reaching multitudes, who, but for their exertions, would probably never clearly have discerned the eternal difference between right and wrong. They have rescued many youths in business houses and in colleges from vice, and they have become a religious educating force of no mean power. So, likewise, the evangelizing movement, of which Mr. Moody is the chief representative, is in several particulars a new departure from old methods. Revivals formerly were conducted in churches, the present evangelical "missions" are mainly held in hippodromes, rinks, halls, or theatres; the first depended almost exclusively on preaching, the second very largely on singing; and the first were marked by the excitement of so-called altar exercises, but the latter are distinguished by the quiet instruction that takes place in the inquiry room. Objections may easily be

brought against both; but in our judgement the "missions" are preferable to the "revivals;" yet both of them, in addition to the actual increase of church membership, accomplish a great deal in the way of conversions never reported to deacons or pastors, and which in their turn elevate the moral tone of many households and are particularly helpful to children. The Church unquestionably should sustain these aggressive endeavors, and the appropriation of some of their working plans and the cultivation of their spirit, may be what is needed to render her more efficient in her peculiar sphere as the source of righteousness. Be this as it may, these new departures should be regarded as precursors of others, and earnest Christians should diligently coöperate with whatever seems to promise good to the world. But at the same time they should not fail to use, and if necessary improve, the instrument that is ready for their service.

This brings us naturally to the Sabbath-school, the most potent religious agency yet devised and employed by the Church of Christ. It is mighty as it is, but it may be made mightier. Already it can train millions in practical morality, but there are other, and as many millions as yet unreached. We are of those who would like to see one afternoon each week devoted to its work. Just as we have a prayer-meeting for adults on Wednesday or Friday, so would we have two hours on some weekday afternoon set apart for the religious and moral culture of children. The brief time allotted on Sunday to this cause is hardly commensurate with its importance. Not as much can be accomplished as ought to be in one hurried session; and several advantages would also be gained by a second, especially if held on a week day. It would for instance, enable the pastor to come into closer relations with the young of his flock; and it would likewise tend to arrest the growth of an impression, now alas! too common, that

religion, and with it right conduct, is essentially a something for the Sabbath. But preëminently, this additional session would furnish the opportunity needed for more thorough instruction, and for such catechetical exercises as would help in developing the conscience of the child. While we are anxious for some such reform as this, we are, if anything, more anxious for the extension of Sunday school privileges, even as they are, to the now neglected offspring of the wretched and degraded. Society has the right to demand this at the hands of the Church; nor is this beyond her power to perform. She has wealth enough, and a membership numerous enough, to bear Christs' gospel to every boy and girl in the land. Her failure to do so is from lack of will, not of means. Even though it may not always be possible to rent halls in filthy and vile neighborhoods, it cannot be impracticable to procure rooms here and there where groups of children may be gathered. Some churches have held with success what are known as cottage prayer meetings, and many persons have been blessed in attending them. Why not adopt the same method, when better ones are beyond our reach, in dealing with the children of the criminal and the unfortunate classes. This surely would be better than nothing. We ought not to be too choice about means. The work to be done is the one thing that should concern us, and we should hasten to its performance however rude may seem the appliances at our disposal. Certainly, so long as it is neglected the ethical education of Society is woefully incomplete. Moreover, the Church has no right to wait on the slow action of the State, in hopes that by legislation the moral condition of these waifs and arabs may be improved. The cry of these forlorn little ones ought to smite her ear and heart, and impel her to do something for their spiritual well-being worthy her glorious Lord, and the glorious mission He has entrusted to her

zeal. As Robert Raikes said, "they are as sheep without a shepherd," and they cry for pasture and a fold. Who shall hear and help if not the church, who shall lead them to quiet resting places if not the bride of Christ? Mrs. Browning has pathetically portrayed the bitter lot that curses the little slaves of the loom. Read her words; they are significant:

> Well may those children weep before you,
> They are weary ere they run;
> They have never seen the sunshine, nor the glory
> Which is brighter than the sun.
> They know the grief of man but not the wisdom;
> They sink in man's despair without its calm;
> Are slaves without the liberty in Christdom,
> Are martyrs, by the pang without the palm—
> Are worn, as if with age, yet unretrievingly
> No dear remembrance keep—
> Are orphans of the earthly love and heavenly,
> Let them weep! let them weep!

But thousands who never saw a loom are equally miserable. They too are slaves, are strangers to any love, human or Divine, and spend their weary days in the darkness and night of crime and vice. And has the church nothing more to say than "Let them weep! let them weep?" Shame on her, and shame on her despicable affectation of benevolence if that is all! It has been given her by her Savior to speak words of cheer, and hope and faith; and He has given her more than words; He has bestowed on her His Spirit—unless she has grieved Him away—to inspire her with His compassion for the weak and wretched. Her duty is plain. The moral training of humanity is involved in her spiritual mission. Grounded as it is in religion, she is eminently and supereminently qualified to carry forward this sublime work successfully. She is to prepare the people for earth as well as for heaven; and to do this she is bound to guide them in the ways of righteousness.

And as the young are more plastic and pliable than the old, she is specially bound, while not neglecting the latter, to bestow most of her care on the former; and if she can only be brought to realize her opportunity and responsibility in this regard, the Education of Society will in the future be more general, more comprehensive and complete than ever in the past.

X.

THE HOPE OF SOCIETY.

Whence such love
Of fighting somehow still for fighting's sake
Against no matter whose the liberty
And life, so long as self-conceit should crow
And clap the wing, while Justice sheathed her claw.
* * * * * For truth and right, and only right
And truth,—right, truth, on the absolute scale of God,
No pettiness of man's admeasurement,—
In such case only, and for such one cause,
Fight your hearts out * * * * * * *
* * * Endure no lie which needs your heart
And hand to push it out of mankind's path.
* * * * * We were they who laid her low
In the old bad day when Villainy braved Truth
And Right, and laughed, "Henceforward, God deposed,
The Devil is to rule forevermore
I' the world!"—whereof to stop the consequence,
And for atonement of false glory there
Gaped at and gabbled over by the world,
We purpose to get God enthroned again
For what the world will gird at as sheer shame
I' the cost of blood and treasure.

Robert Browning.

THE poet from whose inspiring pages we have so frequently quoted in this book, wisely observes:

To save society was well: the means
Whereby to save it,—there begins the doubt.

This doubt must often be felt in advocating specific remedies; but there is one source of hope, which few will dare

to challenge, and which needs to be made prominent in these restless times of ours.

Westminster, which for centuries has been the theatre of as many notable events as any other spot on earth, has within the past six months presented to the world two scenes remarkable for light and shade and for deep significance. The historical student can easily recall the many famous regal displays, State trials, and parliamentary debates which have occurred in the old hall; and doubtless will be inclined to linger on the condemnation of Charles the First; the prostration of Chatham ending soon after in his death, when pleading for reconciliation with America; and the speech of Burke in which he argued that the establishment of the British Colonies on principles of liberty would yield England greater glory than all the conquests of her warlike ancestors, as meaning more to humanity than the pomp and splendor of princely pageants and the brave attire and lordly magnificence of peers and barons. But neither in the old hall nor the new, have there ever been witnessed more impressive contrasts, or any more suggestive both morally and socially, than have been exhibited in far-famed Westminster this year. Let us observe them.

The Queen opens parliament in person. Her retirement has been long, and once more she proceeds from the palace between files of glittering dragoons, and attended by powdered footmen in gay apparel, and accompanied by nobles and ecclesiastics of every degree. She enters the legislative building and from her throne reads a speech full of fine phrases and glittering generalities about her people, her colonies, her policy, and disappears again like any other royal phantom and play actor. What is the design of this spectacular performance? What purpose is this piece of showy and pompous mediævalism to serve? Evidently it is planned and executed to revive the drooping loyalty of

the masses, to appeal to their imagination, and to blind them by its glare to the iniquitious and tyrannous measures by which the Throne has misgoverned Ireland. The fact that such an appeal has to be made, and an effort put forth to cover with tinsel finery the wrongs and cruelties of successive sovereigns, is indicative of the tremendous strides democracy has made of late. Victoria and her advisers by this parade acknowledge that they must placate the nation, that they must have its moral support; and this is at once to confess that they are no longer supreme. The other scene to which we have referred, is even more striking; and while it is the very opposite in all essential features to this, yet it supplements and completes the lesson conveyed by the regal show. William Ewart Gladstone leaves his residence for the House of Commons. No soldiers support and guard his carriage, no bedizened lackeys burden his horses with their lazy weight; but multitudes throng on every hand with waving caps and noisy cheers, and as as he passes to the tribune render to him the tribute of their confidence and love. There he stands on the eighth of April, an old man with giant mind and eagle eye, the scowling brows of the Tories bent upon him, the fealty of his own adherents wavering, the queen frowning on him, and disaster and defeat grimly confronting him; there he stands, as once stood Huss before the Council of Constance, or as Luther stood before the Diet of Worms, strong in the consciousness of his integrity to plead for justice, for justice to Ireland; not for titles, gifts, and honors, but for justice, simple justice, first, last and altogether. As we read his magnificient utterances, as we fancy that we hear them, and as we find ourselves agreeing that at the heart of the remedy he proposes "the social happiness, the power, and the permanence of the Empire" in security reside, we cannot but recall the wondrous portrait drawn by Browning:

Thus the man,—
So timid when the business was to touch
The uncertain order of humanity,
Imperil, for a problematic cure
Of grievance on the surface, any good
I' the deep of things, dim yet discernable,—
This same man, so irresolute before,
Show him a true excresence to cut sheer,
A devil's-graft on God's foundation-stone,
Then—no complaint of indecision more!
He wrenched out the whole canker, root and branch,
Deaf to who cried the world would tumble in
At its four corners if he touched a twig.

In extolling Mr. Gladstone we would not be understood as pronouncing an opinion on the merits of the scheme which he submitted to parliament. We are not sufficiently versed in such matters to speak confidently of the statesmanship revealed in all his measures. What we do perceive, what we do appreciate, is his desire that justice shall henceforth reign in the relations between England and Ireland. He raises his voice—and this is what we approve—against mere policies, expediences, and sophistries, and insists on pure and absolute justice. But more than this—and it is this which completes the significance of the scenes we have attempted to reproduce—he seems to say, that in this age of democracy, in this age when kings and queens tremble before the millions, neither state-craft nor any other kind of craft can conserve the highest interests of Society. Perhaps they never could; but now more than ever, justice is indispensable to the welfare and happiness of the race. This is the message that comes to us from these recent events enacted in the halls of Westminster; and this is our own solemn and deliberate conviction. We believe with Theodore Parker that "justice is the key-note of the world, and all else is out of tune;" and with Chateaubriand, "that justice is the bread of the nation;

it is always hungry for it;" and with Diderot that "justice is the first virtue of those who command, and stops the complaints of those who obey." A Finland story relates how a mother found her son in a thousand fragments at the bottom of the river of death. She gathered the scattered members to her bosom, and rocking them to and fro, sang a magic song which united them again and restored the departed life. That mother is justice, her voice is law, which as Hooker has it, "is the harmony of the world," and by which, if not alone, at least supremely, can all discordant, dissevered and warring classes of Society be brought into closest fellowship and be charmed into mutual esteem and fair accord.

A recent article in the *Forum* has revived that tragic episode of the "Odyssey," where Ulysses on his return to his wife Penelope, murders the suitors who had beseiged her during his absence, also destroying some dozen of her faithless female attendants. Telemachus, his son, takes the nurse, Euryclea, to behold the bloody spectacle, and she gives way to unbounded joy. The writer then adds: "Three thousand years ago, among one of the most highly civilized peoples then existing, it was felt that if woman stumbled unexpectedly on the bleeding and mangled bodies of a company of men whom she hated, the most natural thing for her to do was to feel great joy and give loud expression to it. If a virtuous woman had in her charge a company of disobedient and unchaste girls, she was merely evincing her high standard of morals and sense of duty in leading them out in a body to be slaughtered like sheep." This, he says, is what we are to learn from the passage. He makes this statement, and rehearses the classic story, for the purpose of showing how changed is humanity from this type, and that he may more effectively point out the extreme to which modern philanthropy has been carried. It is, in his opinion, diseased, morbid, mischievous. He

says that a brutal murderer in New York during the last few weeks of his life, was the recipient of many delicacies supplied by ladies. Maxwell, he might also have cited as an other instance in point. He, too, has received flowers and various other marks of sympathy from the ladies of St. Louis. We are not hastily to conclude that these females would not sicken at the sight of blood, would not faint were a murder committed in their presence, and would not condemn every kind of suffering. Far from it: only the source of these intense feelings is a perversion of a sound sentiment. They are nervous, excited, hysterical and are as much overcome by deserved pain as they are by undeserved anguish. In what they do they are not so much moved by love of humanity as by love of self. They are afflicted themselves, and their maudlin interest in the criminal is only a form of interest in themselves. Were it otherwise, they would recognize that the punishment of rascality carried safety, respect and honor to virtue. Herbert Spencer deplores this false sentimentalism; and Carlyle grows indignant that it should occupy so large a place in our age. But whatever may be said in its defense, one thing is very evident, the pauperism and the wretchedness of Society have not been diminished by its offices. Never were charities as numerous and as magnificent as they are today. The moneys now contributed in this country and in England by benevolent minded persons are sufficient to provide for the actual needs of every destitute family. Modern benefactions are without a parallel in history. Unquestionably, therefore, something is wrong, something is out of sorts. What is it? May it not be that we have drifted into erroneous conceptions, and appreciate if not too highly, at least disproportionately, some blessings such as liberty, liberality and even culture? For weary centuries men have toiled for freedom, and they have sacrificed that enlightenment might be the privilege of the many, and

have preached and taught that money-giving to the poor is the duty of all. We have become enamored of these things. Contemplating the world's dire distress, we have cried out, "Be free": and multitudes are free—to starve. Seeing the wants and woes of mankind, we have appealed to education—that the misery may be more intense by being known, we suppose; or we have advocated wholesale almsgiving, by which personal dignity is diminished and general shiftlessness increased. But all this time we seem to have overlooked the functions and value of justice. It does not occur to us that after all liberty is but a temple for the exaltation of justice, and that it is not only without God and altar when justice is absent, but is preparing to crumble to pieces. Nor does it occur to us usually that culture is or should be the real preparation for the exercise of justice, and that charity can only supplement the sterner virtue and can never be its substitute. We have mystified ourselves, have surrounded ourselves with poetic clouds, have fallen into shallow babblings about "light and sweetness," and have almost entirely lost sight of what is in reality the corner-stone of the social structure. A writer in 1853, earnestly said, "The oppressed classes do not want charity but justice; and with simple justice the necessity for charity will disappear or be reduced to the minimum." (See *Sovereignty of the Individual.*) Ruskin has repeated this idea; and we are satisfied that not until justice shall be enthroned in business and in all other relations, as well as in the administration of law, will Society be delivered from the foes which now invade and ravage. Every school boy has heard the story of the widow intercepting the progress of Philip of Macedon with a petition. He put her aside, and she indignantly cried, "I appeal." "Appeal," replied the monarch, "to whom?" Swift and sharp the answer came, "From Philip drunk to Philip sober." So at this hour the starved and sorrowing

are appealing from Society intoxicated with sentiment and rhapsodies concerning feedom and charity, to Society sobered by justice; and when justice shall be reasserted, then may we hope to see but few of the gaunt faces and withered forms which are now both a reproach and a threat. And then

> Yea, even from these, who grim and stern,
> Glared anger upon you of old,
> Oh, citizens! Ye then shall earn
> A recompense right manifold.
> Deck them aright, extol them high,
> Be loyal to their loyalty;
> And ye shall make their town and land
> Sure, propped on Justice' saving hand,
> And Fame's eternity.

Hume has an essay on the subject of this paper, in which he attempts to trace the origin of justice to utility. In doing this he imagines a reign of abundance in which neither clothing nor husbandry would be required, and where there could be no question regarding mine and thine; and he argues that in such an earthly Paradise the virtue we are considering could have no place. An era of universal benevolence would exclude it; for if we were generous and seeking to give there would be no need for strictly defined rights. This conception he illustrates by reproducing the mythical sway of Saturn in which exertion was not required, and where no passions such as greed or ambition marred the happiness of mankind. In these circumstances justice would be swallowed up by benevolence. We are not going to controvert his utilitarian theory: we have no confidence in it; but we shall not debate its merits. There is, however, one thought not undeserving of notice suggested by his essay. It is this: while justice does not spring from the idea of the useful, it certainly, according to his showing, is in itself of the highest practical value. If only the reign of Saturn would

supersede it, so long as that reign is delayed it must be vital to order and prosperity. We know there is nothing like this halcyon period experienced on earth at present. Rather the opposite. Our age is Saturnian in quite another sense: in the sense described by the *Dunciad:*

> Then rose the seed of Chaos and of Night
> To blot out order and extinguish Light,
> Of dull and venal a new world to mould
> And bring Saturnian days of lead and gold.

If these lines portray Society as it is, then while universal love would be delightful, in its absence we must have universal justice. This will be more apparent if we will only take pains to form an adequate conception of the comprehensive character of the principle itself. The reflections of wise men will assist us materially in this endeavor. Aristotle regards it as a complex virtue: "For as it is the habit which disposes to allegiance to the laws, and as laws prohibit excesses of every kind, and encourage virtues of all kinds, this will have respect to them all." Hence, he adds, that it is moderation, as regulated by wisdom; and that it always gives to every man his own. It consists, according to Cicero, *in suo cuique tribuendo,* in rendering to every one his right. The Pythagoreans regarded it as inclusive of all duties, and the word "righteousness" is employed in the Bible in the same manner. Whewell says, that "it excludes cupidity or eagerness in our desires for wealth; all covetousness, or wish to possess what is anothers; all partiality, or disposition to deviate from equal rule in judging between ourselves and others. The rule of action is, let each man have his own, except so far as the former rule directs him to do so. Justice gives to each man his own; but each ought to cling to his own, not from the love of riches, but from the love of justice." Well may Addison in view of such an ethical quality as this, exclaim, "To be perfectly just is an attribute of the Divine

nature; to be so to the utmost of our abilities is the glory of man": may we not add, and the glory of Society as well? Now who can doubt but that the supremacy of this principle would in a great measure allay strife and bitterness, and lead to general prosperity and happiness? Were the authorities to see that all men had their dues; were the members of every community to respect each others' rights; were they "to curb desire within the bounds of the enough"; "were they to widen their means by narrowing their wants"; and were they

> To reverence their conscience as a king
> And glory in redressing human wrong,

there would be ample opportunity for every individual to earn a living; there would be more than sufficient remuneration to meet actual necessities; there would be few, if any, degrading conditions in life; and there would be much more contentment, mutual confidence and fraternity.

But it is very difficult to be really just. Not many can say of themselves, we are

> Blood trained up nine centuries
> To hound and hate a lie;

and fewer still who are as exacting with themselves as they are with others. Dr. Johnson, after large observation, said, "I have found men more kind than I expected, and less just." This to our readers may appear to be wholly an exceptional experience. They are mistaken. Let them think of the leading characters of history, and we are assured they will conclude that Dr. Johnson had good reason for his opinion. Dr. Withington, in *Bib. Sacra* (vol. xxviii.), makes the following remarks on the point before us:

> Dean Swift singles out six characters to form a sextumvirate of worthies to which all the ages of the world could not add a seventh.

And who were these rare birds? Brutus; his ancestor, Junius, Socrates, Epaminondes, Cato, and Sir Thomas More. Leaving out those who do not belong to this age, Marcus Brutus and the Utican Cato remain; both of them old women in their politics, and hypocrites and scamps in all their private conduct. Cicero let the cat out of the bag in his letters—the only true history of that period. Brutus was a kind of Sir Giles Overreach, a gross exactor, willing to take a ruinous interest, and to collect it by most ruinous methods. Cicero was obliged to remonstrate with him. And the spotless Cato, when the spotless Clodius sent him to rob the Cyprians, on purpose to make him as bad as himself, accepted the office on the same ground that a conscientious rum-seller sells liquor to drunkards—because if he does not, somebody else will.

Yet these names are associated in our mind with the loftiest sentiments of patriotism, and of heroism. They could talk beautifully, and at times act beautifully; but when it came to absolute square dealing they were apparently deficient in discernment and decision. In any ordinary circle of acquaintance multiplied instances will occur of men who are yielding and affectionate at home, but who are harsh and overreaching abroad. They even find it easier to give money than to divide a portion of the profits among those whose labors have earned them; easier to be charitable than upright. Perhaps this is to be explained by the loud eulogies usually pronounced on philanthropic generosity, and by the indifference of Society as a rule to mere exactness of conduct. There is praise for the one, and only respectful silence for the other. If a man who never pays his debts is liberal with his alms a thousand excuses are invented to palliate his delinquencies; whereas if he only honors his obligations and never contributes to the relief of the poor, he is set down as sordid and close-fisted. No wonder, then, that he should be influenced by public opinion and should conclude that charity is better than justice. Moreover, he hears continually that the former grace "covers a multitude of sins," and with-

out stopping to ascertain the precise force of this passage, he infers that it opens a way of escape when he neglects and insults the latter. It is the boast of many gamblers and of bohemians generally that they are generous to a fault, and they quietly assume that they have Scripture warrant for the belief that God will take this in full quittance for unpaid board and tailor bills, whatever Society may say about it. Thus deluded, it is not strange that the rule of equity should be held by a great many persons as of secondary importance only. Nor is this the sole cause that operates to its disadvantage. Somehow we have come to associate the idea of justice with courts of law, with judges and with the tedious technicalities of jurisprudence. We think of it on the bench, guarded by policemen, and dealing in somnolent platitudes. Having assigned it a specific place in the social economy, it is our aim to keep out of its clutches; and if this can only be done, we lay the flattering unction to our soul that however numerous may be our frauds and oppressions, we are above reproach. Almost anything and everything passes for right in our times that does not land the perpetrator in the penitentiary. So long as such ideas prevail, so long as we invest justice with officialism, as in England it is invested with a wig, and fail to see that it is an every-day principle, applicable to every commonplace relation, and needing no formal and public installation to render it dignified and authoritative, we shall find it next to impossible to cultivate it as a personal virtue indispensable to genuine worthiness of character. Nor should it be overlooked that rarely, indeed, do men propose justice as the end and aim of their existence. Some doubtless do; but the number is inconsiderable. The majority have other ambitions. To be rich, to be famous, to be learned—these are our aspirations, and we set out to achieve them, not being always particular as to the means we employ. The celebrated Patin, on a

memorable occasion, said: "An ancient Greek had a lyre, whereof one string was broken. Instead of replacing it with gut, he chose a silver cord; and the lyre lost its tune." The larger part of humanity has imitated the foolish Hellenist. Harps are we; but we have substituted the silver ambitions of earth for the cord of justice received from heaven; and the result is we are out of tune ourselves and Society is not in harmony about us. Any one can see that we are likely to get what we go for, and if we are for obtaining wealth we shall at least not gain moral distinction. Important is it that the very desires of the heart be regenerated. Suppose that we should covenant with each other to live for justice, to strive for it, to defend it, and, if needs be, to die for it. What a change would ensue. There would be no knowing our old world under such a *régime*. But beyond this, what a magnificent type of character would be developed. Such a purpose as we have suggested would elevate the individual, would free him from sordidness, cupidity and all the other mean vices that follow in their train. Unhappily the ideal is not easily realizable; and this fact, taken together with the other difficulties we have sketched, makes plain why it does not triumph everywhere to the joy of the race.

But even this apology does not fully extenuate the prevalence of injustice. While it does so in some degree, it does not do so completely; neither does it materially lessen the criminality of those who think and act as though no everlasting law of right were binding on them. Perhaps their apparent oblivion to its claims is to be explained by a failure to discern in their conduct anything deserving of censure. We are at the best inconsistent mortals, and while we very readily perceive what is wrong in our neighbors, we are usually slow in detecting it in ourselves. It may not, therefore, be out of place to illustrate this thought, especially as it will enable us to form a better and clearer

idea of the extent to which injustice is being carried in modern Society.

During the period of intense religious and political agitation in France, Mademoiselle de Montpensier said that she had effected more through the mouth of her preachers than all others with their intrigues, arms and armies. This, however, was not very creditable to the preachers; for it implied that they were partisans, and were not over-nice in what they said to gain their end. It is related of Paul V. that on one occasion he said: "Let us pray God to inspire Cardinal Duperron, for he will persuade us, whatever he chooses." This was a distinguished compliment; and yet there is the insinuation that the Cardinal's wonderful eloquence was not always careful to keep within the bounds of truth. The position of the clergyman is certainly one of great influence and responsibility; and these increase in proportion as he is able to bring to his office the graces and arts of oratory. He may become merely the echo of public opinion, as the Montpensier preachers were, or the demagogue, as we fear the brilliant Duperron sometimes was. When this is the case, he falls a long way beneath his opportunity. The minister of Christ should be preëminently just. Many teachers insist that he shall be a loving being, having faith and piety; but they rarely perceive that above all he should be just. He has to point out the iniquities of others, and has constantly to discriminate in the domain of motives; and frequently he has to arbitrate between contending parties and conflicting interests. He needs something of the judicial instinct, grounded in the most conscientious veraciousness, if he is to discharge his functions honorably. Yet, how little of this quality we discern in the pulpit. Its representatives are generally very ready to detect public outrages, and not a few are quite willing to say precisely what they think of them; but in doing so, and on other

occasions, not unlikely they will practically allow in themselves what they condemn in others. We heard a popular preacher say once that it cost $100,000 for every "pig-tail," meaning by the chaste allusion every Chinaman, who was reported converted. Doubtless he had no design to deceive; nevertheless the statement was unfair and inaccurate. Another minister in his zeal set the number of fallen women in Chicago so high that every ninth or tenth female would naturally be subject to cruel suspicion. Now there is nothing gained by such exaggerations. They do not convince anyone; and recklessness in sacred places encourages it elsewhere. Nor is this all. Ministers have incurred the suspicion of partisanship, especially in regard to the disputes between the rich and the poor. It is thought by the laboring classes that they are quick to recognize the iniquity of a "strike," but not of a "lock-out;" that they are prompt to denounce a "boycott" by the "Knights," but not to condemn the magnates who, by undercutting of rates, try to "boycott" a rival railroad; and that they are all the while covering up the delinquencies of the affluent, while they are ever exposing the shortcomings of the needy. They say that such treatment is not fair, and they have a very ugly way of characterizing the shepherds who seem to think more of the fleece than of the sheep. Unquestionably these critics are themselves not always fair in their censures; but the fact remains that they drift away from Divine worship, and render no practical allegiance to Christianity. Not unexpectedly we discover while they are complaining of the clerical order, they, too, are guilty of tyrannies and oppressions.

In South Framingham two or three years ago, an efficient artisan was obliged to remove, because his fellow workmen would not tolerate his presence among them on account of his superior skill and industry. They insisted that he must come down to their level, or the master must

discharge him. Similar high-handed proceedings we have had of late in the effort made to drive all non-union men out of employment. This is an outrageous procedure. A so-called *voluntary* society sends a committee to a "boss" and says, "you have half-a-dozen persons in your shops who are not members with us, and we demand that you dismiss them." The "boss" calls the men to him, and asks if they wish to join this particular organization, stating that so far as he is concerned it is a matter of indifference. They answer "No." What follows? The union men are commanded to strike, and the master is deprived of the means necessary to fulfill his contracts; and the only way he can purchase peace is by a manifest act of unfair dealing with the non-unionists. Such methods in their essential nature are criminal, and are unworthy lovers of liberty. This sort of compulsion is as tyrannous as any similar act committed by kings or popes, and is just as reprehensible in American citizens as in eastern despots. Again we are reminded of Proudhon's paradox: "No one is less democratic than the people." Hugh Miller verifies this sentiment when he exposes the cruelties perpetrated by stonemasons; and it is every day illustrated by the spitefulness, harshness, and petty cruelties of foremen and forewomen in large establishments. Yet these same foremen, and the toilers who suffer and cause suffering in turn, are clear-eyed enough to detect injustice in their superiors. "That is true," these superiors will doubtless respond; "they are as bad as we are." That may be; but have you who possess your millions ever really stopped to find out how bad you are? You cry against the demands of labor; you characterize its friends as ignorant agitators; and you see nothing sacred but capital. But you are blind, fatally blind, to your own short-comings and inhumanity. The president of the Wabash system of railroads has recently waxed eloquently indignant against the Knights

of Labor, and has shown how these "marauders" have "killed" engines and interrupted traffic. Well, they are to be blamed; but how about the president himself? A Mr. McDowell gave before the House committee as one cause of the southwestern strike, "the universal system of watering railroad stocks, which makes it necessary for railroad managers to screw down the wages of labor as much as possible." Indeed; and in this business the chief of the South-Western is notoriously efficient. With remarkable unanimity the press of the country has characterized him as "a railroad wrecker." Now, if it is unjust to "kill" an engine, what is it to destroy an entire road for one's personal advantage? But this gentleman is not alone in his sin. The *Current*, March 20, 1886, has this astounding statement: "The ethics of business for a generation has been enough to make a Gomorrah of this nation." Is it so? Startling as this statement is we can believe it, and if for no other reason, because the third annual report of the Bureau of Statistics of Labor of the state of New York—1885—sadly confirms it. Commissioner Peck, its author, tells of women toiling eighteen hours for twenty-five cents, of the hard, grinding policy of the "sweaters," or middle men, whose only aim is to make as much as possible out of the poor wretches they employ. The scenes of horror portrayed in this official document are as pitiable and dramatically thrilling as anything in Victor Hugo's "Les Miserables." Not far are we from Sodom, these things being true. We all seem to have gone into overreaching. The riots in Belgium were in part caused by the system of compelling miners to purchase their food on credit from their employers. If the accounts are inaccurate they have no remedy, and the least complaint ends in immediate dismissal, and starvation. Not dissimilar the custom in the West for some railroad corporations to sell a few acres to their brakemen, which they

pay for in installments; and when they have nearly paid to discharge them for some imaginary fault, thus depriving them of the means wherewith to make the final payments, the property in case of failure reverting to the company. Such practices on the part of monopolists and capitalists, or their representatives, are quietly passed over as involving no moral qualities, or at least none of a serious kind; and yet evidently they are charged and surcharged through and through with black injustice. When we think of such things we are painfully reminded of that old form of punishment known in the times "when wretches swung that jurymen might dine," as the *peine forte et dure*. This penalty consisted in pressing the accused to death for refusing to plead. The "Press Yard" at Newgate, though not now used for the purpose denoted by its name, bears silent witness still to the frequency of this torture. The victim was laid on his back with his hands and feet secured; a plank was put on him, and then weights were piled on him until he cried out that he would plead, or was crushed to death. This has its parallel in social life. Thousands of unfortunates are bound hand and foot by poverty, and burdens and cares are multiplied upon them. Every conceivable advantage is taken of them by those whose position is more assured and eligible than their own. Slowly they are ground down until existence is unendurable, and they hail as the only happy moment experienced on earth the one that heralds the opening of a grave. In England during the year 1735 a *dumb* man was condemned to suffer the *peine forte et dure*. His judges would not believe that he could not speak and so they handed him over to this torture, with what results our readers can readily imagine. Oh, sirs, the most wretched of our suffering ones—the women who stitch and starve, and the overtasked children in our factories—are also dumb. They have no voice of their own, nor are there many voices to

plead for them. But their mute helplessness and despair ought to appeal to us more loudly than earthly eloquence can. We have read somewhere that in one of the old cities of Italy the king caused a bell to be hung in a tower and called it the "Bell of Justice." He likewise ordered that any one who had been wronged should ring that bell, and the magistrate should come to his relief. In the course of time the lower part of the rope rotted away, and a wild vine was tied to lengthen it. A starving horse that had been turned out to die in his age seeing the vine gnawed it, and in doing so rang the bell. Straightway came the magistrate, and having ascertained in whose service the animal's life had been spent, he said: "The dumb brute has rung the bell of justice, and justice he shall have; the owner shall care for him the rest of his days." Humane magistrate! But is not the bell of justice ringing now? Hark! it's solemn strokes fall upon the ear of Society, rung by hands hardened with unprofitable toil, by tattered and starved men, women, and children, who are no more to you great ones than the dumb, driven cattle. Listen, listen; let it wake you up! But should you fail to hear, it may rouse the Judge of all the earth, who in his own good time will decree justice; justice that means respite and rest for the oppressed, and retribution and remorse for the oppressor.

It is perhaps impossible for anyone to anticipate in full the beneficent results that would flow to Society from the adoption and loyal application of this principle. We see the bitter dead-sea fruit that has attended its decay; and by contrasting the actual with the problematical we may arrive at least very near to a true conception. The Bible also aids us in such an endeavor. We have in the prophecies wonderful visions of a blissful age, of an era when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together, when childhood shall be innocent and happy, when existence shall be pro-

longed, and when the cry of suffering and the chuckle of fraud shall be heard no more for ever. All of these pictures have their back-ground in the Divine attribute realized on earth—"righteousness." It is called the "reign of righteousness;" it reveals to us a king who is said to "rule in righteousness;" and so prevalent is righteousness to be, that its extent is likened to the waters that cover the great deep. Remember that righteousness and justice are practically synonymous terms, particularly in the language of Scripture, and that we have, therefore, in these representations inspired sanction of the hope defended in this paper. And it is well to mark in passing, that the regeneration of Society is not by this authority ascribed to sentiment, emotion, poetry, or liberty, but to justice; and that here we have confirmation strong of our fundamental position. Sages and saints evidently cannot conceive of a State grounded in any other virtue, if it is to prosper and be permanently honored. Justice is the basis which they make prominent, and never leave the impression that a worthy community could possibly rest on anything less firm and stern. By bringing their views and their expectations together, we may not only gain a glimpse of the land of promise opening before justice, but additional confidence in its power to achieve therein a possession. But though we may not be able to grasp and anticipate in detail all that shall be in the future when kingly righteousness shall reign, we can do, what is infinitely of more importance to us now—we can note the bearing of obligations which it imposes on the welfare of mankind.

In the course of this paper we have found that justice is that which renders to every man his due, or what to phrase it differently, is his right. But this opens a large and serious question: What is the due of every man? How is this to be determined, and what does it involve and guarantee? Rousseau has called attention to the historic

fact that the father of every nation is in some sort a legislator. The names of Moses, Menou, Minos, Solon, Lycurgus, and Numa substantiate this assertion. But above all these great leaders stands Jesus Christ, who legislated, not for a race or country, but for the world. He gave to us, or at least ratified, the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would be done by"—which has commended itself to the conscience, reason and confidence of mankind as the highest formula of social justice. Its hold on the intellectual allegiance of the world is as great to-day as ever, however disloyal the people may be in the conduct of their affairs to its requirements; and on account of its character it is evidently destined to perpetual authority. Here then we have the answer to the question—"what is the due of every man?"—radically and essentially just what is due ourselves. Rendering to all others what we would regard as our right were our positions changed, will come nearer to fulfilling the great idea of justice than any line of action definable. The rule is grounded in the natural equality of humanity, in the native needs of every soul, and in the unquestionable obligation of every other soul not to prevent their supply. Carry out this precept and no woman will be doomed for a beggarly pittance to toil fourteen or sixteen hours a day; no clerk will be compelled to work overtime, as is exacted by some of our wealthiest firms, without additional compensation; no commercial gambler will trick his customers or appropriate trust funds; no judge will betray the cause of the innocent for a bribe; and no laborer will boycott another because he is not a member of a Trades Union; and they will not be guilty of such treatment as they themselves would feel outraged were they obliged to submit to it in their turn. No argument is surely needed to prove that the practical operations of this rule would dry the tears of thousands, would unify the interests of communities everywhere,

would abate arrogance, inspire hope, promote civil order and diminish crime. We will not suppose it possible that anyone can doubt this; and by these desirable results we earnestly urge our readers who are anxious for social reform to leave the quackeries and nostrums of Quixotic Political Economists and adopt and enforce the Divinely-given Golden Rule.

It may possibly assist them to do so, if they will consider the force of a very profound maxim enunciated by Bossuet in his *Politique Sacrée:* "There is no right against right," which Lacordaire thinks finds a higher expression in the formula: "There is no right against duty." Taken either way, we have what is evidently a truism, and one admirably fitted to determine the application of Christ's law in almost any given circumstances. There can be no right against right. There are the rights of property and the rights of wealth. These must be respected; but, however sacred they may be, they are checked and bounded by the right of labor to adequate compensation and of humanity to freedom and respect. No man has such a right in property as to be at liberty to urge the advantage which it gives to the injury of others. It may be said that in employing workmen the master has the right to obtain their services at the lowest market price. Within reasonable limits this is admitted. But when the price paid means slow starvation and swift degradation, he has no right to avail himself of the distress which places these workmen at his mercy. No amount of special pleading can prove that he is warranted in compelling the misfortunes of others to contribute toward his material prosperity. It is no excuse if he abuses his horses and maltreats them that they are helpless, and dependent on him. Society pronounces such a callous wretch deserving of punishment. Even horses have rights that right cannot rightfully invade. How about men? Are they of less worth, and

have they fewer claims on their fellows than animals? Suppose we adopt Lacordaire's formula, and see its practical bearing: "There is no right against duty"; that is, no right you may possess can possibly release you from the duties you owe humanity. What are your duties gentlemen? Do you acknowledge any? Whether you recognize them or not, among them will be found an obligation to pay what you promise, and an obligation to minister to the well-being and not to the evil-being of all about you. You are to respect their manhood and womanhood; you are bound to advance and not retard their interests; and you are bound to sympathize with them, and do all in your power to promote their happiness. And it is to be borne in mind that just in proportion as you are yourselves privileged by genius, position and wealth beyond them, are these duties more imperative. There is no significance in leadership if this is not the case. If God has not endowed some men more richly than others and prospered them more abundantly, that they may be living blessings to the world, then their existence is a reflection on the morality of His government. Such a reflection we resent. Robert Browning interprets better the Divine purpose when he writes:

> 'Tis in the advance of individual minds
> That the slow crowd should ground their expectations
> Eventually to follow—as the sea
> Waits ages in its bed, 'till some one wave
> Out of the multitude aspires, extends
> The empire of the whole, some feet perhaps,
> Over the strip of sand which could confine
> Its fellows so long time: thenceforth the rest,
> Even to the meanest, hurry in at once,
> And so much is clear gain.

They are to open the way for others; they are to help others over barriers and impediments; and they are to champion their cause and encourage their endeavors. Their

privileges correctly construed mean obligations, and their fulfillment is not to be regarded as a favor conferred, but as a debt discharged. Right to own a million dollars or ten million, and rights of brain or of skill, do not exempt, cannot exempt from the performance of duty. Take this thought with you, and you will find no very serious difficulty in applying the Golden Rule; for even when you are in doubt as to what is really your neighbors due, the consideration of your own duty will readily decide the point; and, as Schiller sings,

> Thus linked the master with the man
> Each in his rights can each revere.

And not only so; but thus all classes, ranks and orders would be bound together, and Society as a whole would be cemented, strengthened, prospered. This is our hope. Let justice be thus exalted, and then as Horace expresses it, "man's neck will have no yoke that sorrow draws," and "the wildest blasts that heave the sea will awake no fear of wreck."

If it is necessary to confirm what we have set forth relative to the indispensableness of justice to Society, we need only observe its supreme position in the government of the universe. What it is in the Divine administration we may rest assured, it ought to be in the human. Mark the stress laid on righteousness in the Bible. God claims to be its God; He clothes His people with it; they are to hunger for it, and to be rewarded by it at last. Christ is presented as "the end of the law for righteousness," and His atonement finds its explanation and vindication in the statements that He died the just for the unjust that He might bring them to God, and that God might be just and the justifier of the ungodly. However much salvation was desired by the Father of us all for us all, He would not to secure it jeopardize the sanctity of law. He creates the

impression by the entire scheme of redemption that justice is

> The keystone of the worlds' wide arch;
> The one sustaining and sustained by all,
> Which if it fall, brings all in ruin down.

And the history of the race, which is but a running commentary on His purposes and plans, inevitably drives us to the same conclusion. We there read of nations, of their rise, progress and decay, and at the beginning we always find some virtue, and at the end, some vice and oppression. Not at this late hour is it incumbent on us to verify this statement by causing the melancholy army of nations to march before you. Over and over again have students disclosed the fate of Thebes, of Nineveh, of Athens, of Rome, of Venice, solemn witnesses all that the Lord God omnipotent reigneth, and that He will at last exact from communities as from individuals, penalty for their transgressions. We need not here repeat the accounts of disasters that overtook and overwhelmed these great centers of population. The story is familiar enough; but it may be instructive to notice how God's dealings with men and cities have affected some of the wisest and deepest thinkers of the race. These great minds betray the settled conviction that while human tribunals may be eluded, and the guilty escape the condemnation of earth, it is impossible to avoid the righteous decisions of the invisible Judgment Seat. They seem to be filled with apprehensions and uncontrollable fear before the awful form of that Justice which is independent of secular courts and magistrates, and which is as impartial as it is sure. Ancient and modern literatures are burdened with passages of this character, and often do the words of authors on this theme come to us as the poignant cry wrung from despairing souls. The Tamil proverb fitly introduces these testimonies: "The bitter tears of the oppressed are a file that wears away the wealth

of the oppressor;" and the Arabs have the saying, "There is no protection for the unjust." But if we turn to the classics we find Æschylus affirming, "It remains as long as Jove remains that, he who has done the deed must suffer;" and even Euripides exclaims, "In the end the good obtain their due, but the wicked as they are by nature, will never fare well." Plutarch writing of the miseries which follow crime, says, "The poets and dramatists have borne witness to the apprehensions which attend on guilt. Stesichorus represents the guilty Clytemnestra as having a dream, in which a dragon with a bloody head seemed to approach her, presaging the vengeance which Orestes was to take upon her for murdering his father. They relate of Apollodorus, a monster of humanity, that he dreamed he was skinned alive by the Scythians, and then seethed in a caldron, from which his heart cried out to him ever and anon, "For all this you have to thank me." These terrible forebodings, all inexplicable unless there is an inexorable Judge, recalls the words of the philosophical poet Lucretius: "The sourge, the executioner, the dungeon, the pitchy tunic—even though these be absent, yet the guilty mind with anticipating terror applies the goad, and scorches with its blows." And this again recalls the language of Juvenal: "Whatever sin is committed it always displeases the sinner himself. This is the first penalty, that no guilty man is acquitted when he sits in judgment on himself, though the wicked grace of the prætor may conquer in the fallacious urn." Tennyson has reproduced this thought when he shows that there never can be quiet or peace for man

> * * * to ever bear about
> A silent court of justice in himself,
> Himself the judge and jury, and himself
> The prisoner at the bar ever condemned,—
> And that drags down his life.

But beyond this, Lycurgus to point out the responsibility of men for the wrong-doing of others, said impressively during the trial of Lescrates, "Crimes as long as they are untried, rest upon those who have committed them; but after the trial has taken place, they rest upon those who have not pursued them according to justice. Know well, judges, that each of you now voting secretly will have to show his vote to the gods." In other words, the justice of the universe is so searching and so stable, and is so interblended with the destiny of every creature, that it will punish us not only for our own sins, and for the aid and comfort we give to the iniquities of others, but for the decisions we reach and pronounce, if not in accord with law and with fact. It was the realization of this truth that led Daniel Webster in closing the trial of Prescott, 1821, to appeal fervently and solemnly to the judges :

It is not the world's revision I would call on you to regard, but that of your own conscience, when years have gone by and you shall look back on the sentence you are about to render. I entreat you for your own sakes to possess yourselves of solid reasons, founded in truth and justice for the judgement you pronounce which you can carry with you till you go down into your graves; reasons which it will require no argument to revive, no sophistry, no excitement, no regard to popular favor, to render satisfactory to your consciences; reasons which you can appeal to in every crisis of your lives, and which shall be able to assure you, in your own great extremity that you have not judged a fellow creature without mercy ?

So magnificent, and benign and terrible is justice! Before her Shakspeare and Schiller bring the masterful characters they have created, and in the workings of their conscience disclose the awful majesty of her power. As seen in their wonderful portrayals she is indeed regal, glorious, divine. Her voice wails through the chilly halls of Inverness castle: "Macbeth has murdered sleep ; Macbeth shall sleep no more ;" her soundless feet fall in Richard's tent, and from the grave she calls forth the victims of his

cruelty to sit heavy on his sword ; her invisible hands plant in the bosom of the adulterous queen the thorns that "prick and sting her ;" her presence haunts the guilty even in far off desolate islands, and keeps before him the face of one betrayed :

> Oh, it is monstrous, monstrous!
> Methought the billows spoke and told me of it ;
> The wind did sing it to me; and the thunder,
> That deep and dreadful organ pipe, pronounced
> The name of Prosper.

And from his impregnable stronghold she drags Francis von Moore in his dreams to the judgment seat, and shrieks in his ear the damning word "Parricide," and fills his soul with horrible questionings:

> Why creeps this shudder through my frame?—To Die!—Why does that word fright me thus?—To give an account to the Avenger, there, above the stars! and if he should be just—the wail of orphans and widows, of the oppressed, the tormented, ascending to his ears, and he be just ?

Yes; He is just; these pangs, agonies and forebodings are evidences conclusive that He is; and if He is, and if His justice in the government of the universe is thus all-pervasive ; and if all schemes, plots and wiles fail to elude it, and if it is the foundation of His kingdom and the source of its stability, must we not conclude that human Society will be stronger, more sacred and more prosperous, when it is made the rule of its conduct and the end of its institutions? If God cannot dispense with justice, and if its subversion would spread disorder and ruin throughout his domains, may we not take the warning and believe that no remarkable change for the better can take place in our affairs until we have determined to do it honor? Assuredly no earthly organization can stand or flourish where its authority is denied, and its supremacy is scorned. We may have a secular administration as perfect as that of

Cæsar Augustus, where law and order were more highly esteemed and more regularly enforced than under any other ancient monarch; and yet, like his empire where no enthusiasm for right prevailed, our country may fall to pieces, as Imperial Rome did, through multiplied corruptions and dishonesties polluting and emasculating the heart. Something like this already threatens us as we have seen in the course of these studies; and in confirmation of the alarm we have given, Dr. Engel, director of the Royal Statistical Office of Berlin, sends forth this solemn word: "There is, notwithstanding all the humane endeavors on the part of individual employers, and the heroic exertions after frugal self-help on that of many workmen, *a consumption of men in favor of capital*—a consumption which, by wearing out the vital strength of individuals, by enfeebling whole generations, by breaking up families, by letting men run morally wild, and by its destruction of all alacrity in labor, endangers in the highest degree the state of civilized society." Woe to Europe, woe to America if this tendency shall continue; and woe to every community if nothing is done to eradicate the sense of wrong from the heart of the lowly, suffering millions:

> "Yea, woe when in the city's heart
> The latent spark to flame is blown;
> And millions from their silence start
> To claim without a guide their own."

Matthew Arnold has said that "religion is morality touched by emotion;" certainly justice to be really justice must be touched by religion. Never can it be produced and maintained by Agnosticism and Utilitarianism. They may develop something that looks like it, as a mask may resemble a face or an artificial flower one that grows in our gardens. But as these are not identical, so neither is the pliant time-serving quality called justice by the worshipers of expediency one and the same with that inflexible virtue

which is born of sincere belief in the eternity and immutability of right. The faith that has for its first term the Unknown and for its last the Unconscious, can never give rise to the true and grand idea of obligation. A recent writer has presented what he describes as the Apostate's Creed: "I believe in the Chaotic Nebula, self-existent Evolver of Heaven and earth * * * in the disunion of saints * * * the dispersion of the body, and in Death Everlasting, amen:" and the latest formula of the ethics derived from these doctrines we have in the language of a popular infidel: "Do the best you can in existing circumstances." Policy, policy, nothing but policy, expresses the quintessence of their morality; and policy has been the curse of several generations gone, and is so still. We have been taught, and many yet teach, that we are to do what is best, not what is right, and by a species of metaphysical juggling an effort is made to show that what is best is certainly right. If there is to be a salutary change, if hope is to dawn upon us, the nations must return to God. Only in the light of His being and of our relations to Him, can we grasp the force of the idea involved in the term "owe," and come to realize that there is a necessary and ceaseless distinction between right and wrong. When these things are understood, then there will no longer be one law for Rome and another for Boston, nor one law for the rich and another for the poor; and then instead of permitting circumstances to determine our line of action, it will in essential morality be the same under every variety of conditions. Nathaniel Hawthorne relates the New England legend of the Old Gray Man who appeared in Boston when the emissaries of the Catholic James harassed and distressed the citizens. On the day when they paraded in the streets with drums and muskets, and when the people looked on sullen and helpless, an aged puritan suddenly appeared. He was dressed in the costume of some sixty years before,

and leaned heavily on his cane. No one knew him. Onward he walked, and stopped the little army, and rebuked its leaders, predicting the accession of William to the English throne. Then he disappeared as suddenly as he came. No one knew whither he went; but years after he strode down King street when the hireling troops fired on the crowds there gathered; and at Lexington he was seen inspiring the farmer-soldiers, and at Bunker Hill he moved among the patriots, aiding them and encouraging. Hawthorne tells us he is the spirit, or the representative of the spirit of New England. To us he is something more; he represents the genius of Puritanism, of the faith that made the Colonies strong and fearless, that laid the foundations of our national life, and that made our fathers the sworn enemies of tyranny. The Old Man is needed once more. Open the way there, and invite him back. Something more valuable than liberty is imperiled, precious though that blessing is. Justice has been stricken down, she lies prostrate and bleeding in our streets; the deadly bullets of monopoly, selfishness, anarchy, and impiety have torn, lacerated and maimed her. There is no help for her unless the old Puritan comes back. Faith of our sires return, return; breathe upon us; kindle anew our devotion; and then touched by the very life of God, justice shall revive, shall seize once more her scales and sword, and in her stainless robes and from her sacred throne shall rebuke the oppressor, succor the oppressed, and throughout the earth bring in the age of purity, prosperity and peace.

This is the Hope of Society.

Not Socialism, not Communism, not Land Confiscation, not Paternalism, not Anarchy—but JUSTICE! Justice, first, last, and altogether; Justice equal and exact to all persons, of whatever rank or opinion, religious or political.

Date Due

[redacted]

FACULTY

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

HN64 .L87
Studies in social life: a review of the
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00025 3684